

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 646. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6407, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2201). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4410. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939; with amendment (Rept. No. 2202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6644. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLAND (by request):

H. R. 6645. A bill to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Merchant Marine Reserve; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6646. A bill to establish the office of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6647. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to provide a further exemption from maximum-hour provisions; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 6648. A bill to extend to certain veterans the veterans'-preference provisions relating to Federal employment; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 6649. A bill granting certain lands to the State of Arkansas and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 6650. A bill to grant an increase of pensions to certain widows of veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 6651. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of persons assuming the duties of postmaster at fourth-class offices during the absence of postmasters at such offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6652. A bill to permit members of the State Guards to retain uniforms and articles of clothing issued under the authority of the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 647. Resolution to provide for a survey to determine a site for a Federal penal or correctional institution to supplant the Federal penitentiary on Alcatraz Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. Res. 648. Resolution for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the financial operations of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6653. A bill for the relief of Harry Snyder; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6654. A bill for the relief of Eugene Tetinek, Samuel T. Wesley, Jack B. Kontchak, Lloyd Ahvakana, Isaac Kisserak, Tim Gologergon, Hoover Koonalook, and George Luke; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6655. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Biederman, Frederick Terrel, and William Huttula; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6656. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mary Margaret Grant, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 6657. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6658. A bill for the relief of Benzo Okada; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 6659. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Meyers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. MANKIN:

H. R. 6660. A bill for the relief of the estate of Chester S. Wright, Jr., deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6661. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6662. A bill for the relief of Marion N. Harper; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6663. A bill for the relief of Chester C. Churchwell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 6664. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Henry Vande Weg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 6665. A bill for the relief of Mose Altman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6666. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Jane Steffen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 6667. A bill for the relief of Joe G. McInerney; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, the fierce storms sweeping across our world have left us weary with watching; these testing times have found out our every weakness. While the tempest still is high, we turn to the infinite calm of Thy changeless love that we may find inner sustenance, wells of living water springing up, courage in battling for truth and serenity under strain. Give us a readiness for the austere disciplines of self-control, so that our minds and bodies may be the channels for kindling thoughts and soaring ideals and power

to match great needs with great deeds. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 3, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### FERRIS RUGGLES—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 200)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

*To the United States Senate:*

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1563, "An act for the relief of Ferris Ruggles."

This bill would compensate Ferris Ruggles in the amount of \$2,167.78 for property damage and loss of earnings sustained and expenses incurred by him as a result of an accident involving an Army vehicle.

It appears that on April 18, 1944, at about 7:15 p. m., an Army carry-all operated by a woman employee of the War Department on official business, was proceeding west on U. S. Highway No. 60 in Texas at a speed of approximately 30 miles an hour and approaching the entrance to the English Air Field, about 6 miles east of Amarillo, Tex. It was still light and the three-lane highway was dry. A tractor with semitrailer attached, owned by Ferris A. Ruggles and Frank T. Smith, a copartnership doing business as the Fergus Co., and operated by their employee, J. H. Wheeler, acting within the scope of his employment, was also proceeding west on the same highway at an undetermined speed behind the Army vehicle. The semitrailer was carrying 2,815 gallons of gasoline. As the Army carry-all neared the entrance to the English Air Field, situated on the south side of Highway No. 60, the driver thereof moved the carry-all into the center traffic lane and reduced her speed, preparatory to executing a left turn into the driveway to the airfield. Then, without giving any hand signal, she began to turn left just as the driver of the civilian vehicle, who sounded no warning with his horn, moved into the extreme left traffic lane and attempted to pass to the left of the Army vehicle. When the driver of the civilian vehicle saw that the Army carry-all was turning to the left he continued to move his vehicle to the left until it was entirely off the pavement on the south side of the highway. At the same time the Army driver swerved her vehicle to the right in an attempt to avoid a collision. Notwithstanding such movements the two

vehicles sideswiped and the civilian truck and trailer went out of control, struck a culvert, and overturned in the ditch on the south side of the road. The civilian tractor and trailer were extensively damaged, the entire load of gasoline was lost, and Mr. Wheeler sustained personal injuries.

While the driver of the Army vehicle was negligent in failing to indicate by a proper hand signal her intention to make a left turn and in failing to ascertain whether such a turn could be executed in safety, the driver of the civilian tractor was also negligent in attempting to pass to the left of the Army vehicle without indicating such intention by sounding his horn, particularly when the position of the Army vehicle in the center lane of a three-lane highway near the point where a road turned off to the left to the English Air Field, and the reduction in the speed of the Army vehicle should have suggested to him the probability that it was about to turn to the left. Furthermore, the driver of the civilian vehicle, in view of the combined weight and length of the tractor and trailer and the inflammable cargo carried in the trailer, was under a duty to exercise more than ordinary care in handling such vehicle, and it was negligence on his part to persist in his attempt to pass the Army vehicle when he saw, or should have seen, that he could not do so in safety. That the driver of the civilian vehicle was negligent in this respect is also indicated by the fact that the civilian vehicle skidded 200 feet before it came to a stop.

Since the driver of the civilian vehicle was acting within the scope of his employment at the time of the accident and his negligence is therefore imputed to his employer, Mr. Ruggles, there is no justifiable basis for a claim by the latter against the United States on account of the property damage sustained and losses incurred as a result of this accident.

I am, therefore, constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 4, 1946.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### INCREASE IN LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 201)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for an increase in a limitation on an appropriation for the Department of Justice, fiscal year 1947, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list

of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### RESTRICTIONS ON GRAINS AVAILABLE FOR MANUFACTURE OF BEER—MEMORIAL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Mel Greenthal, secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin State Council of Brewery and Soft Drink Workers, a memorial signed by a hundred thousand persons remonstrating against present and future restrictions on the quantity of grains available for the manufacture of beer. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Greenthal's letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the heading of the petitions. The memorials are so bulky that I have not brought them to the floor, but I will see that they are delivered to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wisconsin is granted and the letter and petitions will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter and the heading of the memorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WISCONSIN STATE COUNCIL OF BREWERY AND SOFT DRINK WORKERS, Milwaukee, Wis., June 3, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,  
United States Senator for Wisconsin,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LA FOLLETTE: Under separate cover I am sending you petitions with 100,000 signatures, protesting present and future restrictions on the quantity of grains available for the manufacture of beer. A sample of these petitions is enclosed. Please see that they are recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and send me a copy of same. I am also writing to all other Wisconsin legislators in Washington, D. C., advising them that I have sent these petitions to you.

I should also like to have you notify Secretary of Agriculture Anderson of the receipt of these petitions, or present them to him—whichever you deem advisable.

Your cooperation in this matter will be deeply appreciated by the 100,000 people who signed these petitions. From time to time you will be receiving more of these signed petitions, all of which I would appreciate having handled in the same manner.

With best wishes and kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

MEL GREENTHAL,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

#### A PETITION PROTESTING PRESENT AND FUTURE RESTRICTIONS ON THE QUANTITY OF GRAINS AVAILABLE FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF BEER—"THE BEVERAGE OF MODERATION"

(Sponsored by Wisconsin State Council of Brewery and Soft Drink Workers)

Whereas the 30-percent reduction in the amount of grains for use in the manufacture of beer has brought about an acute shortage in the "beverage of moderation," thus depriving many Americans of their right to enjoy it;

Whereas this reduction has already created hardships to workers in brewing and its allied industries through unemployment, in many cases recently returned veterans, who have been laid off as a direct result of present grain restrictions;

Whereas barley, the principal grain used in the manufacture of beer, is used but little for human food, and thus could be of small consequence in alleviating the suffering of starving peoples abroad;

Whereas the protein content of barley is much higher after the grain has been spent in the brewing process than when used whole, and the byproduct of malt houses goes into livestock and chicken feeds; thus creating no waste whatsoever;

Whereas the decrease in Federal and State revenues from beer means higher income and property taxes;

Whereas our servicemen fought and bled for the democratic American way of life, which certainly includes the right and privilege to enjoy the refreshment of a glass of beer;

Whereas any further restrictions would aggravate the hardships placed upon thousands of brewery and allied workers and their families through added unemployment, would still further increase taxes, and would cause even more severe shortages of the "beverage of moderation," thus depriving Americans, still more, of wholesome enjoyment and refreshment;

Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of the United States, protest against the present 30-percent reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer, and protest any further restrictions which may be under consideration now, or at any future time, and hereby request our Senators and Representatives to vote for the elimination of present restrictions, and against any additional restrictions at any time. We further respectfully request that this petition be referred to the proper committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT ACT—PETITIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have received a large number of letters from men in the service, all of the same general character, seeking the extension of the Draft Act in adequate form. I ask that one of these letters, representing all of them, be printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,

Senator from Michigan:

We, as draftees in the service and relatives and friends of these men in service, have tried to look at the recent actions on the part of Congress with an impartial viewpoint. Yet, regardless of what attitude we have taken, the same facts result, and they are not favorable to Congress.

We see men more interested in their individual chances for reelection this coming fall than they are in the preservation of peace and the equal distribution of justice to all elements in the United States.

Our commitments to the United Nations have been saddled largely on the Army. The Army has pointed out that to accomplish these objectives a certain number of men will be required, and Congress has approved of this number. We do not need to be military strategists to see that these figures are important.

None of us want to be in the Army. But we consider it the duty of every American, when it is necessary, to sacrifice for his country.

Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson has announced that the Army intended to release men with 18 months' service if replacements

were available. He can make no clearer statement nor make provisions for what will happen after July 1 until he knows what Congress is going to do. It was this practice of inconsistency that resulted in mass GI protests last January. However, this time it is not the War Department that is to blame.

Congress has now decided that we must serve longer so that the 18- to 20-year-olds not in the Army shall not be required to serve at all. It would interest us to know how many inductees there are now in service between the ages of 18 and 20 who still have to serve from 6 months to a year longer.

The apparent injustice of congressional action becomes quite real to us when we recall that not quite a year ago these same Congressmen were working on the present recruiting program.

This program provides for 18-month enlistments directly from civilian life and 1-year enlistments for anyone with 6 months of service. These 1-year and 18-month enlistments will be up shortly. Are draftees to be kept in service longer than Regular Army men?

The price one must pay for the natural desire of civilian soldiers to become civilians again seems dear.

This is not our endorsement of permanent compulsory military training. It is only our endorsement of the continuance of the United States as a contributor to world peace and an equitable distribution of the responsibility toward that end among all Americans.

Therefore, we are asking you, as our representatives; we are telling you as our public servants, to vote for the extension of the draft in its wartime emergency form.

Each of us believes that our Senators and Representatives know of the importance of the Army to world peace. But we are tragically disappointed that, realizing these things, they have stooped to political ambiguity in an election year.

Tech. Sgt. DON MCNEIL.

DETROIT, MICH.

#### PROPOSED CONTINUATION OF PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a statement from the American Farm Bureau Federation with respect to the bill to continue price controls. I fully endorse the program suggested and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1946.

The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at its meeting in Chicago on May 31, 1946, adopted the following resolution relating to pending legislation to continue price controls:

"The American Farm Bureau Federation was one of the first organizations representing a large segment of our society that insisted upon the control of inflation and has constantly supported legislation for this purpose. We have insisted that price control when necessary must apply equitably to all segments of our economy, including agriculture, labor, manufacturers, distributors, and all others. Notwithstanding farmers' insistence on these policies, the administration has bowed to the demands of labor and other groups for inflationary increases in their price and wage levels. This failure to hold the line has undermined price control as a method of controlling inflation. OPA's unrealistic administration has restricted production so much that it has in itself become a major inflationary factor. The only hope now is to correct the basic causes of inflation, includ-

ing revision of Federal tax, monetary, and credit policies.

"The American Farm Bureau Federation insists that a definite schedule for the complete removal of consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities not later than December 31, 1946, must be enacted and price ceilings adjusted correspondingly. We further insist that provision be made for prompt elimination of price ceilings on any commodity or items whenever the current supply of such commodity or item is reasonably in line with current requirements and a definite schedule providing for this should be included in the law. Unless these provisions are included we will not support the extension of the Price Control Act.

"We further recommend that the authority for establishing, removing, and reestablishing price ceilings on agricultural commodities and determining adjustments necessary in order to obtain adequate production be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. We also suggest that an independent decontrol board be established with final power to decide when supplies of nonagricultural products are in sufficient supply to warrant removal of controls.

"We are sure that there are many agricultural commodities which are either in sufficient supply or in which black-market operations are so excessive that it is apparent that OPA's efforts have totally broken down to the extent that consumers are receiving little benefit from the price ceilings, and on which price control should be terminated immediately. We would support the specific exemption of these commodities in legislation proposed to Congress."

I hope these recommendations will meet with your approval.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,  
President.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 706. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1408);

S. 2100. A bill to remove the limitations on the amount of death compensation or pension payable to widows and children of certain deceased veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409); and

S. 2235. A bill to provide a system of relief for veterans, and dependents of veterans, who served during World War II in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of July 26, 1941, of the President of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1419).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2200. A bill to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 1410).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

From the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1235. A bill to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums; without amendment (Rept. No. 1411); and

H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413).

From the Committee on Military Affairs:  
S. 1672. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Department of the Interior of surplus lands and property of Federal agencies on reclamation projects; with amendments (Rept. No. 1412).

From the Committee on the Judiciary:  
H. R. 5716. A bill to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1414).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1578. A bill to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1415);

S. 1915. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., as the Clarence Theodore Hoverson Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416);

H. R. 5149. A bill to govern the effective dates of ratings and awards under the Veterans' Administration revised schedule for rating disabilities, 1945, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417); and

H. R. 5626. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1418).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S. 2210. A bill to provide for the return of certain securities to the Philippine Commonwealth Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 1420).

#### PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of May 1946, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

JUNE 3, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of May, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum):

CARL A. HATCH,  
Chairman.

By STEWART A. HATCH,  
Clerk.

JUNE 3, 1946.

To: Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

From: Senator PAT MCCARRAN, chairman, Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration and Use of Public Lands.

The following persons have been assigned to the above subcommittee by the Department of Agriculture to assist with its work:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF-12; basic salary, \$5,000 per annum.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF-5, basic salary, \$2,000 per annum.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. ELLENDER introduced Senate bill 2289, to extend, for one additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 2290. A bill to authorize the furnishing of motor equipment to seriously disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2291. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a vessel to the American Antarctic Association, Inc.;

S. 2292. A bill for the relief of the Miami Herald, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Daily News; and

S. 2293. A bill for the relief of Robert John Townsend; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2294. A bill to provide for requiring compliance with safety regulations in coal mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2295. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. A. Marigeau; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

## EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1937

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend for one additional year the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar.

For more than 100 years, the sugar industry of Louisiana has sought and received the protection and encouragement of the Federal Government. The foundation of this protective policy has been that in times of emergency sugar produced at home would constitute a basic supply for the American consumer. Never before has this claim for a protective tariff, or protective quotas, been so fully justified as has been the case during World War II, and continuing during the postwar emergency of extreme shortage of sugar in the United States market.

At the beginning of the war, in spite of production limitations and acreage curtailments, the producers of sugar in the mainland beet area and the mainland cane area were able to furnish the more substantial part of the total supply of sugar available to the American consumer. In 1942, sugar produced on the mainland was used in every State of the Union, and this supply made it possible to have a reasonable ration unit for sugar in the United States.

The record of production in the mainland cane area, and especially in the State of Louisiana, has constituted a fine contribution to the welfare of the American consumer during the war emergency, which is not yet over from the standpoint of sugar shortage.

The following production figures for the mainland cane area are reported by the Crop Reporting Board of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture:

Year:	Short tons, raw value
1936	437,000
1937	462,000
1938	583,000
1939	504,000
1940	332,000
1941	419,000
1942	460,000
1943	498,000
1944	437,000
1945	482,000

It has been a source of disappointment to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and to me, as I am sure it is to the two Senators from Florida, that the bill proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], Senate bill 2249, fails to take into account the record of the mainland cane area in proposing changes within the quota structure of the Sugar Act.

Although a series of meetings have been held by representatives of the beet-sugar-producing States and the cane-refining States, representatives of the mainland cane area have not been brought into consultation, and no attention was given to their record. There was nothing sacred about the original ratio of quotas as established in the Sugar Act of 1934, and that ratio was changed in the Sugar Act of 1937. Likewise, the very limited term of the Sugar Act suggests that Congress has wanted to take into consideration from time to time the record of ability to produce and to distribute in the United States sugar market. Otherwise there would have been no reason for restricting the term of the Sugar Act to 3 years or less, in each instance where the act has been amended and extended.

The bill that I am introducing simply extends the Sugar Act for another year. It is to be hoped that due regard will be given to the mainland cane area if and when the question of quotas is considered by the Congress. I will be much disappointed if the quota of the mainland cane area is not increased by at least 150,000 tons of sugar. It is necessary that mainland sugar production be stimulated to the end that production be increased to a minimum of 36 percent of our consumption requirements.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2829) to extend, for one additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## TITLES TO LANDS BENEATH TIDEWATERS AND NAVIGABLE WATERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles, which were ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 3, line 14, after the word "line" insert the word "lawfully"; and at the end

of the bill add the following new paragraph: "Nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to prejudice or adversely affect any rights the United States may have in and to the subsoil and sea bed of or the resources in the continental shelf lying oceanward from the area described in the first clause (1) of the preceding paragraph."

## REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let Congress Reorganize Itself," published in the Buffalo Evening News of June 1, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

## IS RUSSIA PREPARING FOR WAR?—ARTICLE BY EDDY GILMORE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Five Years in Russia Convince Gilmore Reds Want No War," written by Eddy Gilmore and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 3, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 470. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of W. P. Richardson, as successor and assignee of W. P. Richardson & Co., of Tampa, Fla.;

S. 769. An act for the relief of H. H. Ashbrook, and others;

S. 913. An act to protect scenic values along and tributary to the Catalina Highway within the Coronado National Forest, Ariz.;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke;

S. 1286. An act for the relief of Sam Bechtold;

S. 1605. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities;

S. 1802. An act to provide for the delivery of custody of certain articles of historic interest from the U. S. S. Nevada and the U. S. S. Wyoming to the State of Nevada and the State of Wyoming, respectively;

S. 1805. An act to authorize the promotion of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war;

S. 1854. An act to establish the civilian position of Academic Dean of the Postgraduate School of the Naval Academy and compensation therefor;

S. 1862. An act to repeal section 1548 Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 592);

S. 1871. An act to authorize the conveyance of a parcel of land at the naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., to the American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.;

S. 1872. An act to provide for the rank of original appointments in the Corps of Civil Engineers of the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1959. An act to authorize the payment of additional uniform gratuity to Reserve officers commissioned from the status of aviation cadets; and

S. 1978. An act to authorize the restoration of Philip Niekum, Jr., to the active list of the United States Navy with appropriate rank and restoration of pay and allowances.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1776) to authorize the exchange of certain land at the Benicia Arsenal, Calif., with

amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Karl E. Bond;  
H. R. 797. An act for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.;  
H. R. 975. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers;  
H. R. 1258. An act for the relief of Cecil Atkinson;  
H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of the Hatheway Patterson Corp.;  
H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Cox Bros.;  
H. R. 1614. An act for the relief of Jennie Olsen Andersen;  
H. R. 2287. An act for the relief of Susan S. Wiseman;  
H. R. 2325. An act to extend the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to officers honorably discharged from the Army under Public, No. 259, Sixty-seventh Congress, June 30, 1922;  
H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of Gaylon Dhu;  
H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Juan Calcano;  
H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and the legal guardian of Jane O'Brien;  
H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk;  
H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Philibert L. Bergeron, Alfred Quist, and Astrid Quist;  
H. R. 3401. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Main Babcock, Chester N. Main, and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Norman;  
H. R. 3455. An act for the relief of Chat-ham M. Towers;  
H. R. 3484. An act for the relief of the Poultry Producers of Central California;  
H. R. 3494. An act for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes;  
H. R. 3508. An act for the relief of the Northern Lumber & Millwork Co., of Spokane, Wash.;  
H. R. 3623. An act for the relief of William A. Pixley;  
H. R. 3672. An act for the relief of Dimple Benoit;  
H. R. 3827. An act for the relief of Fred W. Grant;  
H. R. 4247. An act for the relief of Jesus Lassalle and Mrs. America Bonet Medina;  
H. R. 4353. An act for the relief of Amy Mary Richter;  
H. R. 4357. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Alberto Lopez Ramos;  
H. R. 4433. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Alabama for use as a public park of the military reservation known as Fort Morgan;  
H. R. 4458. An act for the relief of Rosella J. Masters;  
H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Francis T. Lillie and Lois E. Lillie;  
H. R. 4479. An act for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson;  
H. R. 4486. An act to abolish the Santa Rosa Island National Monument and to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of that portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior;  
H. R. 4525. An act for the relief of Oran Edmund Randall Rumrill;  
H. R. 4673. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Jenkins Ward;  
H. R. 4701. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries;  
H. R. 4834. An act for the relief of the estates of Katherine Delores Booth and Agnes Jane True;  
H. R. 4862. An act for the relief of Walter R. Newcomb, Sr., Corbin A. Newcomb, and Walter R. Newcomb, Jr.;  
H. R. 4863. An act to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes;  
H. R. 4888. An act for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher;  
H. R. 4917. An act for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.;  
H. R. 4919. An act for the relief of Archibald J. Alcorn;  
H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joan Esther Hedin, a minor;  
H. R. 5026. An act for the relief of the estate of Drury Lee Jordan;  
H. R. 5053. An act for the relief of the estate of Jasper A. Mealer;  
H. R. 5228. An act for the relief of Stephen Lisy;  
H. R. 5284. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucy T. Harris;  
H. R. 5324. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Francoline and Mrs. Rose Wallace;  
H. R. 5349. An act for the relief of Charles F. Barrett;  
H. R. 5351. An act for the relief of Charles Booker;  
H. R. 5510. An act for the relief of Newton William Lowery;  
H. R. 5538. An act for the relief of Mae Maxine Stone;  
H. R. 5539. An act for the relief of Andrew M. Halvorsen;  
H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of F. B. Sweat;  
H. R. 5552. An act relating to the sale by the United States of surplus vessels suitable for fishing;  
H. R. 5595. An act for the relief of Marjorie See;  
H. R. 5640. An act to reestablish the status of funds of the midshipmen's store, barber shop, cobbler shop, and tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;  
H. R. 5676. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real estate in Converse County, Wyo.;  
H. R. 5739. An act for the relief of Frances Fitzgerald;  
H. R. 5792. An act for the relief of certain postmasters;  
H. R. 5806. An act for the relief of Etta Yoakam;  
H. R. 5872. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Keaton;  
H. R. 5878. An act for the relief of Elsie Elmhurst;  
H. R. 5884. An act for the relief of Frances Krzys;  
H. R. 5907. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Lebanon County, Pa., and for other purposes;  
H. R. 6035. An act to provide that there shall be no liability for acts done or omitted in accordance with regulations of the Director of Selective Service, and for other purposes;  
H. R. 6069. An act to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944;  
H. R. 6153. An act to remove the existing limitation on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration;  
H. R. 6371. An act to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6463. An act to provide for making certain War Department articles and equipment available for use at the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be held in Boston, Mass., in September 1946;  
H. R. 6486. An act to authorize an appropriation for the establishment of a geophysical institute at the University of Alaska;

H. R. 6533. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes;  
H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Inter-American Trade Exposition, Fort Worth, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and  
H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to correct a technical error in the act approved April 18, 1946 (Public Law 347, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4510) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact between Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the waters of Costilla Creek and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Karl E. Bond;  
H. R. 797. An act for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.;  
H. R. 975. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers;  
H. R. 1258. An act for the relief of Cecil Atkinson;  
H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of the Hatheway Patterson Corp.;  
H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Cox Bros.;  
H. R. 1614. An act for the relief of Jennie Olsen Andersen;  
H. R. 2287. An act for the relief of Susan S. Wiseman;  
H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of Gaylon Dhu;  
H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Juan Calcano;  
H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and the legal guardian of Jane O'Brien;  
H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk;  
H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Philibert L. Bergeron, Alfred Quist, and Astrid Quist;  
H. R. 3401. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Main Babcock, Chester N. Main, and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Norman;  
H. R. 3455. An act for the relief of Chat-ham M. Towers;  
H. R. 3484. An act for the relief of the Poultry Producers of Central California;  
H. R. 3494. An act for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes;  
H. R. 3508. An act for the relief of the Northern Lumber & Millwork Co., of Spokane, Wash.;  
H. R. 3623. An act for the relief of William A. Pixley;  
H. R. 3672. An act for the relief of Dimple Benoit;  
H. R. 3827. An act for the relief of Fred W. Grant;  
H. R. 4247. An act for the relief of Jesus Lassalle and Mrs. America Bonet Medina;  
H. R. 4353. An act for the relief of Amy Mary Richter;  
H. R. 4357. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Alberto Lopez Ramos;

H. R. 4458. An act for the relief of Rosella J. Masters;

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Francis T. Lillie and Lois E. Lillie;

H. R. 4479. An act for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson;

H. R. 4673. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Jenkins Ward;

H. R. 4834. An act for the relief of the estates of Katherine Delores Booth and Agnes Jane True;

H. R. 4862. An act for the relief of Walter R. Newcomb, Sr., Corbin A. Newcomb, and Walter R. Newcomb, Jr.;

H. R. 4888. An act for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher;

H. R. 4917. An act for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 4919. An act for the relief of Archibald J. Alcorn;

H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joan Esther Hedin, a minor;

H. R. 5026. An act for the relief of the estate of Drury Lee Jordan;

H. R. 5053. An act for the relief of the estate of Jasper A. Mealer;

H. R. 5228. An act for the relief of Stephen Lisay;

H. R. 5284. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucy T. Harris;

H. R. 5324. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Francoline and Mrs. Rose Wallace;

H. R. 5349. An act for the relief of Charles F. Barrett;

H. R. 5351. An act for the relief of Charles Booker;

H. R. 5510. An act for the relief of Newton William Lowery;

H. R. 5538. An act for the relief of Mae Maxine Stone;

H. R. 5539. An act for the relief of Andrew M. Halvorsen;

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of F. B. Sweat;

H. R. 5739. An act for the relief of Frances Fitzgerald;

H. R. 5792. An act for the relief of certain postmasters;

H. R. 5806. An act for the relief of Etta Yoakam;

H. R. 5872. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Keaton;

H. R. 5878. An act for the relief of Elsie Elmhurst; and

H. R. 5884. An act for the relief of Frances Krzyz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2325. An act to extend the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to officers honorably discharged from the Army under Public, No. 259, Sixty-seventh Congress, June 30, 1922;

H. R. 5552. An act relating to the sale by the United States of surplus vessels suitable for fishing;

H. R. 6035. An act to provide that there shall be no liability for acts done or omitted in accordance with regulations of the Director of Selective Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6463. An act to provide for making certain War Department articles and equipment available for use at the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be held in Boston, Mass., in September 1946; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4433. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Alabama for use as a public park of the military reservation known as Fort Morgan;

H. R. 4525. An act for the relief of Oran Edmund Randall Rumrill;

H. R. 4863. An act to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5640. An act to reestablish the status of funds of the midshipmen's store, barber shop, cobbler shop, and tailor shop at the

United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to correct a technical error in the act approved April 18, 1946 (Public Law 347, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4486. An act to abolish the Santa Rosa Island National Monument and to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of that portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; and

H. R. 5676. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real estate in Converse County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 4701. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 5595. An act for the relief of Marjorie See; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 5907. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Lebanon County, Pa., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6069. An act to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944;

H. R. 6153. An act to remove the existing limitation on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6371. An act to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Inter-American Trade Exposition, Fort Worth, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6486. An act to authorize an appropriation for the establishment of a geophysical institute at the University of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6523. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

**EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940**

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment I intend to offer at the proper time. I ask that the amendment be read and printed and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, ordered to be printed, and to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 4, line 4, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 4, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new paragraph:

"(5) No individual shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act, if he has served on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States after September 16, 1940, and was discharged or released from active service

under honorable conditions. Any such individual who was inducted without his consent after being so discharged or released and is serving on active duty when this paragraph becomes effective shall, upon his request after August 1, 1946, be relieved from his period of training and service under this act."

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Hereafter no individual who has been transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 3 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, shall be ordered to active duty for a longer period than 15 days in any one calendar year without his consent."

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hayden	Overton
Austin	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Ball	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Huffman	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Buck	Kilgore	Saltmire
Burch	Knowland	Shipstead
Bushfield	La Follette	Smith
Butler	Langer	Stanfill
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McKellar	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
Ellender	Mead	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Millikin	Wagner
Fulbright	Mitchell	Walsh
George	Moore	Wheeler
Gerry	Morse	Wherry
Green	Murdock	White
Gurney	Murray	Wiley
Hart	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICAN ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, America has been shocked by the vicious outpouring of intolerance which has followed the end of World War II, a war for liberty and freedom of all peoples. This intolerance has been directed against the

traditional victims—American minority groups, such as the foreign born, the Catholic, the Jew, and the Negro.

Every American-thinking American deplores and will fight this evil of bigotry, racial and religious hatred, and persecution, whether it be under the title of Ku Klux Klanism or any phony, high-sounding title. Every American-thinking American knows that each human has a right to be considered on his own individual merit rather than on the basis of what the color of his skin is, which church he attends, or where his ancestors originated.

Mr. President, one of the groups which is the victim of this outpouring of hatred has been the some 5,000,000 Americans of Jewish faith. Yet these Americans, like their coreligionists throughout American history, yield to no group in their patriotism, in their magnificent war record, in their wholesome contributions to science, literature, the professions, industry, and commerce.

Yes, on the field of battle, the Americans of Jewish faith have more than proved their stalwart Americanism. In the war just concluded they contributed the equivalent of 37 divisions to our armed forces, or some 550,000 men and women.

Nearly 7,500 Jews are already known to have died in the service of their beloved land. Authentic records show that some 23,000 fell as casualties. Almost 17,500 Jewish men and women have already received citations of valor and merit.

Mr. President, years ago in the darkest days of the war I pointed out that there was in the Middle East a considerable reservoir of Jewish manpower which was ready, willing, and eager to bear arms in the service of the United Nations against their terrible persecutor who exterminated 6,000,000 of their brethren. Yes, this Jewish manpower was eager to fight and, if need be, die, preferably under their own flag, but in any case in the cause of world freedom. Unfortunately, the policies of the British Empire were such that this reservoir of manpower was not fully utilized.

America, however, gratefully accepted the contributions of her Jewish sons and daughters in the armed services, and, as a result, they have made the magnificent record which I should now like to cite.

The Jewish Welfare Board has prepared a leaflet entitled "These Are the Facts," which reflects Jewish contributions to American victory. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this leaflet be reprinted in the Record.

May it serve as an answer to the bigots and hatemongers in our midst who would vilify our fellow Americans of Jewish faith and any other minority.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**THESE ARE THE FACTS—AS OF JANUARY 1, 1946**

(This is the fourth issue of These Are the Facts, bringing the figures up to January 1, 1946. This leaflet has been prepared in response to numerous requests for a few salient facts concerning Jewish participation in the armed forces of the United States in World War II.)

(Bureau of War Records, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York, N. Y.)

**CASUALTIES**

(Returns on casualties are not yet complete)

Nearly 7,500 Jews are already known to have died in service, 6,000 in combat. The total number of all casualties, thus far definitely authenticated, is 23,401.

**550,000 IN SERVICE**

Studies by the Bureau of War Records indicate that 550,000 men and women of Jewish faith have served in the armed forces of the United States in the course of World War II, or, in military terms, the equivalent of 37 divisions. Population studies completed in 20 representative American cities demonstrated that the percentage of Jews in uniform was equal to, and in a number of cases was higher than, the ratio of Jews to the general population.

**DENTISTS IN SERVICE**

Thirty percent of the Jewish dentists in the New York metropolitan area saw service in the military forces of the United States, according to a study made by the JWB Bureau of War Records.

**CONTRIBUTION**

Thousands of Jewish families have given three or more members to the service.

Nineteen such families have contributed six members each.

Thirteen more families have contributed seven members each.

Four other families have contributed eight members each.

**RANK**

Twenty-one men of Jewish faith have attained senior rank in our armed forces in World War II. Seventeen were generals: 6 major generals and 11 brigadier generals; 4 were admirals or commodores: 1 vice admiral, 2 rear admirals, and 1 commodore.

**SACRIFICES**

There are known to be at least 46 Jewish families in the country in which two members have given their lives for the United States. One family lost three sons in service.

**PHYSICIANS IN UNIFORM**

More than one-third of all Jewish physicians of the United States were in uniform. A survey covering all of New York State, eastern New Jersey, and 22 medium-sized communities all over the country revealed that about 60 percent of all Jewish physicians, under 45, in those areas, were in our armed forces.

**CITATIONS, DECORATIONS, AND AWARDS**

(Returns on awards are not yet complete)

Close to 17,500 Jewish men and women in uniform have already received citations for valor and merit, many of them posthumously. These men and women hold an aggregate of 33,446 awards. The number of men receiving the 4 highest awards were: 1 Congressional Medal of Honor; 64 Distinguished Service Crosses; 27 Navy Crosses; 34 Distinguished Service Medals.

In addition, Jewish men and women were the recipients of the following awards: 160 Legions of Merit; 1,115 Silver Stars; 1,656 Distinguished Flying Crosses; 162 Soldier's Medals; 29 Navy and Marine Corps medals; 3,114 Bronze Star Medals; 10,810 Air Medals; 11,765 Purple Hearts.

**BRANCHES OF SERVICE**

Jewish men and women served in every type of military activity—on the ground, in the air, on and under the sea.

Statistics on over 60,000 men, compiled by war record committees in 181 cities and towns, showed that 80 percent were in the Army, 17 percent were in the Navy, 2 percent

in the Marine Corps, and 1 percent in the Coast Guard.

Of those in the Army, one-sixth were in the Infantry, one-twelfth were in other ground force units, nearly 3 out of 10 were in the Air Force, and of these almost one-fourth were flying personnel.

"In common with all who fought and died for victory, the Jewish men and women of the armed forces were motivated by unity of purpose and animated by faith in the American way of life. The best monument to their memory would be the kind of world to justify their faith and their sacrifice." (President Harry S. Truman.)

"The sacrifices of war drew no line of color or race or creed. That spirit of brotherhood must continue and be extended. Our armed strength and the world organization which we are striving to build will be ineffective for peace, if here at home and in our foreign relations we permit prejudices and hates to warp our attitudes. Prejudice and hate, the weapons the totalitarian gangsters used in their conspiracy to subvert the world, must be eliminated if we are to rebuild it. The National Jewish Welfare Board and the other members of the United Service Organization proved that the spirit of brotherhood was one of the ingredients of victory. We must never forget it is an essential ingredient in an enduring peace." (Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson.)

**THE CASE LABOR BILL**

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the Case labor bill is generally said to be in grave danger of a Presidential veto. There is so much loose comment on the radio, in the press, and particularly in official publications of certain labor organizations and by certain labor bosses that the bill was a death blow to organized labor, a step backward to the Dark Ages, and destroyed all constructive labor legislation, that it appears important to point out that such comments are designedly building up a false and erroneous impression as to the effect of the law. The purpose of this sort of inspired propaganda, of course, is to bring undue political pressure upon the President. There is no attempt to discuss the merits of the law, but, on the contrary, the howling campaign avoids such discussion.

The fact is there is nothing in the law that possibly can be called antilabor.

The Senate amendment prohibiting coercion or violence to restrain the movement of goods in interstate commerce was adopted by a vote of 59 to 22. Does the President care to say, by a veto, that he favors coercion and violence as employed on numerous occasions by various labor organizations? What weight can be given to a labor organization or a labor boss who would resist this provision of law?

The amendment prohibiting secondary boycotts or combinations between employers and employees to fix prices, allocate customers, or restrict production, distribution or competition, was adopted 53 to 19. Would the President, by his veto, desire to say that he favored secondary boycotts and combinations of employers and employees to fix prices, restrict production, distribution, and competition?

The amendment providing for fact-finding commissions with respect to labor disputes involving public utilities was adopted 59 to 19. The President recommended a similar provision with respect to all labor disputes. Would he now, by a veto, desire to say that he was opposed to such procedure with respect to labor disputes involving public utilities?

The amendment defining supervisory employees to exclude employees who are, in fact, a part of management, from collective bargaining under the Labor Act, was adopted 48 to 30. The purpose is to prevent management from sitting on both sides of the table in the settlement of labor disputes. Does the President, by his veto, care to say that he favors such possible domination of labor organizations by management in collective-bargaining negotiations?

The amendment providing that when the Mediation Board offers its services in the settlement of a labor dispute, no strike shall be called for 60 days pending negotiations was adopted 54 to 26. Does the President wish to say that he opposes such strike delay pending negotiations for settlement of labor disputes? Does he wish to infer that he believes paralyzing and devastating strikes should be inaugurated prior to the exhausting of such reasonable administrative processes?

The amendment making labor contracts enforceable as to all parties in the Federal Court was adopted 50 to 28. Does the President, by his veto, care to say he favors no legal restraint on the repudiation of labor contracts? Does the President care to say that he would deny aggrieved parties to a labor agreement the same legal remedies available with respect to all other contracts?

The amendment providing welfare funds may be created and maintained by employers or employees separately or jointly, subject to certain conditions and regulations, was adopted 47 to 30. Does the President, by his veto, wish to say that he is opposed to the establishment of such welfare funds?

The legislation, as amended, was passed by the substantial majority of 49 to 29. It was concurred in by the House by a vote of 230 to 106, or more than 2 to 1. The vote clearly reflects the sentiment of the people and the earnest desire of the Congress to bring about more equitable and workable labor laws. There is nothing antilabor in any provision of the legislation. A Presidential veto can only be construed by the people as an irresponsible jockeying for political position at a most critical time.

I hope the President will not yield to certain labor bosses who do not want peaceful labor relations, because only in times of labor unrest can their power continue to grow. I hope the President will not yield to certain political advisers who are afraid of the political power of these so-called labor bosses. If the President does veto this legislation, I hope the Congress will exercise its constitutional right to enact the legislation notwithstanding the veto. If we should fail to do so, we would shirk a great public responsibility. Our failure would be another invitation to the labor racket-

eers to continue the highhanded and ruthless methods by which they have acquired domination and control of government, and have so seriously impaired our economy, that it will take years to repair the damage.

#### INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 268 was favorably reported yesterday from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and is now on the calendar, Calendar No. 1434. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator state the nature of the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the able minority leader that the resolution comes from the Committee on Commerce, a standing committee of the Senate, requesting an additional \$5,000 to carry on the work of that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 268) submitted by Mr. PEPPER (for Mr. BAILEY) on May 7, 1946, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, \$5,000 in addition to the amount of \$5,000 heretofore authorized.

#### INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO PETROLEUM RESOURCES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, some time ago the Senate created a special committee to investigate the petroleum resources of the country in relation to the national welfare. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is chairman of that special committee. He is now requesting an additional \$7,500 for the purposes of completing the investigation and making his final report.

I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 261, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 261) submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on April 19, 1946, which had been reported from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, at the end of the resolution, to strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,500", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth

Congress, second session, agreed to March 13, 1944, and Senate Resolution 36, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, agreed to January 19, 1945 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare) is hereby increased by \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.  
The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### ORJA L. SUTLIFF

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 270, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this resolution deals with the payment from the contingent fund of \$840.34, to Orja L. Sutliff for services rendered in the office of the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] while Mr. Sutliff was on terminal military leave from September 10 to October 31, 1945. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 270), submitted by Mr. ANDREWS on May 20, 1946, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Orja L. Sutliff for services rendered in the office of Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS while on terminal military leave from September 10 to October 31, 1945, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law No. 226, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved November 21, 1945, \$840.34.

#### MEMORIAL OAK ON CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I rise to pay my respects to Mrs. Grover C. Johnson, of Wichita Falls, Tex. She is the mother of 18-year-old Staff Sgt. Grover J. Johnson, Jr., who served as a combat soldier and participated in the Normandy landing as a member of a field artillery unit in the First Army. Realizing how fortunate she was to get her boy back, her sympathy went out to other mothers whose boys and girls did not return. She conceived the idea that a living memorial should be established to all Americans who gave their lives for freedom and democracy in World War II. She believed this living memorial should be in the form of a tree, planted on the Capitol Grounds at Washington, D. C., and nourished by soil from each of the States and Territories whence these patriots came, and which they loved so much.

She communicated this idea to me and it received my hearty approval. I consulted with Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, and we worked out a plan for making her idea a reality.

Working through her American Legion Auxiliary Unit No. 129, Mrs. Johnson sought the cooperation of the Governors of our States, and they all responded by writing her their hearty approval of the

plan and sending parcels of the soil of their respective States.

On last Thursday, Memorial Day, at sunset the dedicatory ceremony took place at the base of a newly planted white oak tree in the east oval of the Capitol Grounds here in Washington.

Capt. Gail T. Judd was master of ceremonies. The national guard of honor for the District of Columbia of the Veterans of Foreign Wars attended in full military regalia. The presentation of colors consisted of flags from each of our 48 States and 4 Territories, presented by young ladies representing the various States and Territories. Rev. Patrick Fitzgibbons gave the invocation.

I was invited to make the dedicatory address. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

On this Memorial Day, 1946, we are assembled here on the Capitol Grounds of our Nation at sunset to dedicate this living memorial to all of our heroic American patriots of War War II, who gave their lives in last full measure of their devotion to a just cause so that we as free men and women might carry on in the traditional American way of life. For making secure to us this priceless privilege we owe to them a never-ending obligation. This solemn ceremony signifies our acceptance of that obligation. The determination with which we unceasingly carry out our obligation will determine the future of this land we love. The sacred soil from each of our 48 sovereign States and 4 Territories from whence sprung these defenders of democracy is here mingled into a united soil to nourish this living memorial to our united heroes who fought and died for a united cause. The sturdy white oak tree has been selected to symbolize this living memorial to those sturdy men and women whose memory we revere today. It is fitting and proper for us to remember that only God can make a tree. It is also fitting and proper for us to remember that only God can provide a fitting haven for the departed souls of those who laid down their lives to make secure our right to worship and serve Him. And it is highly fitting and proper for us to remember that only God can save this Nation. In this dark hour of confusion and chaos may we all dedicate ourselves as His willing workers to serve as unselfishly and unstintingly as did those whose sacred memory we today honor, to the end that freedom and democracy may not perish from this earth, and that those who have made the supreme sacrifice shall not have died in vain.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Following my address, Mrs. Grover C. Johnson, on behalf of the American Legion Auxiliaries, delivered an address. I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

The American Legion Auxiliary of Texas and other auxiliary units cooperating in making this memorial event possible are most grateful to Senator O'Daniel, to Mr. David Lynn, to Captain Judd, and the guard of honor of Washington, D. C., to the commanding general of the District of Columbia, for this lovely 70-piece United States Army Band, directed by Chief Warrant Officer Hugh J. Curry, and to the 48 State governors and 4 possessions who sent the good earth from

those places our heroic dead and living loved the most.

We have met here on sacred ground. We cannot consecrate or hallow this ground where this tree will grow because our gallant sons and daughters have consecrated it far above our power to add to or detract.

Every boy and girl who went forth to defeat the enemy believed that out of those dark days there would come light. Darkness could not long triumph over light nor a lasting victory be given to evil. Peace did finally come, but so many are not here to know about it.

We are told that this is the first time in the Nation's history that a tree has been planted on the Capitol Grounds in an all-States soil.

As these representative girls place the sacred soil about the roots of this tree, it will be as one mother wrote: "The very earth they loved better than life itself because they died fighting for it."

With that thought in mind, we turn to John 15: 13: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

It is the sincere hope of the American Legion Auxiliary that this memorial tree will take root in this soil from the 52 localities and grow and flourish as have the States from whence came the soil; that it will be a symbol of the binding force of democracy that holds together this great Nation.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Official greetings were given by Mrs. Pearl Dyche for the American Legion Auxiliary of Washington, D. C.

Then followed the official roll call. As each name was called, the young ladies, carrying their State flags, marched by the tree and deposited the soil from their respective States and Territories.

As special representative for the President of the United States, Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, Representative from the State of Mississippi and chairman of the House of Representatives Veterans' Committee, accepted the tree on behalf of the President.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks the address delivered by the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative RANKIN.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the President of the United States I desire to accept this token of your patriotism in the form of this living oak which you have just planted, nurtured by soil from each one of the 48 States as well as from the Territories and insular possessions.

It is an all-American tree, and the soil which you have placed at its roots is all-American soil. It will be a symbol of the love and gratitude of all the American people for this, the greatest Government the world has ever known.

The representative of the American Legion Auxiliary which sponsored this magnanimous gesture has called attention to the fact that it is dedicated to our fallen heroes and watered, as it were, by the tears of their sorrowing loved ones.

In accepting it on the part of the President, as well as on the part of the Congress of the United States, I should like to dedicate it also to the future generations of Americans.

This Government is the hope of civilization today and will be, no doubt, for generations to come. When our children gather beneath the shadow of this umbrageous manifestation of your gratitude, to look upon the

dome of yonder Capitol and contemplate the blessings of this great Republic, may they behold a Government more powerful than the Athens of Pericles or the Rome of Augustus, more splendid than the France of Louis, or the England of Queen Elizabeth, more beneficent than anything pictured in the wildest utopian dream, and as enduring as the eternal hills, as she goes down to the future leading the way in the onward march of modern progress toward a greater era of peace, happiness, progress, and prosperity for all mankind.

American institutions can never fail as long as they are supported by the patriotism and devotion of those glorious men who have offered up their lives in her cause, and by the undying devotion of the untold millions of men, women, and children whose love for their country this tree will symbolize.

This Government is here to stay, and, as Chief Justice Marshall once said, to endure throughout the ages. Those alien enemies that now attempt to undermine and destroy it will find their efforts no more effective in the long run than that of the tiny termites that gnaw at the base of Washington's Monument have on the destiny of the Father of our Country.

As this tree grows and spreads its branches and points its towering pinnacle heavenward, America will grow in power, in strength, and in influence throughout the world.

If I might borrow from the lips of a great English poet a verse dedicated to the British Empire, revise it and appropriate it to my own country, I would say:

"All our past acclaims our future; Jefferson's voice and Washington's hand,  
Marshall's faith and Franklin's trust in this  
our chosen and chainless land,  
Bear us witness: come the world against her,  
America yet shall stand!"

Mr. O'DANIEL. The 70-piece United States Army Band, directed by Chief Warrant Officer Hugh J. Curry, played the national anthem, which was followed by a moment of silent prayer. Master Sgt. Charles W. Barnes then played Taps, after which there was a retirement of the colors.

The following young ladies represented their States, Territories, and the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent to have the list printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Alabama, Miss Olivia Prowell; Arizona, Miss Penny Peck; Arkansas, Miss Lucile Trotter; California, Miss Christie Miles; Colorado, Miss Barba Cannon; Connecticut, Miss Ann King; Florida, Miss Jeanne Marsh; Georgia, Miss Modena McDowell; Idaho, Miss Jane Brown; Illinois, Miss Clair McAllister; Indiana, Miss Joan Smith; Iowa, Miss Mary Ann Wilson; Kansas, Miss Jane Perrin; Kentucky, Miss Mary Ann Kirkpatrick; Louisiana, Miss Florence LaCont; Maine, Miss Claire Cochran; Maryland, Miss Helen Dunkelberger; Massachusetts, Miss Janice Torngren; Michigan, Miss Marie Hood; Minnesota, Miss Gwyn Gage; Mississippi, Miss Nell Stokley; Missouri, Miss Wanda Pollock; Montana, Miss Betty McFarlane; Nebraska, Miss Marion Schmidt; Nevada, Miss Barbara McFarland; New Hampshire, Miss Elizabeth Savage; New Jersey, Miss Mary Brummer; New Mexico, Miss Dorothy Belmore; New York, Miss Priscilla Kramer; North Carolina, Miss Jane Moss; North Dakota, Miss Mary Ann Perkins; Ohio, Miss Louise Marshall; Oklahoma, Miss Joan Johnson; Oregon, Miss Patricia Jane Ellsworth; Pennsylvania, Miss Jo Anne Morehouse; South Carolina, Katherine Kitchens; Rhode Island, Miss Adrienne Crafton; South Dakota, Miss Dakota Mullen; Tennessee, Miss Betty

Ann Stewart; Texas, Miss Evelyn Wilson; Utah, Miss Diane Walter; Vermont, Miss Lola Pierotti; Virginia, Miss Ethel Sale; Washington, Miss Elizabeth Johnston; West Virginia, Miss Betty Blair; Wisconsin, Miss Mary McFarlane; Wyoming, Miss Mary Ann Coffman; Alaska, Miss Doris Ann Bartlett; Hawaii, Miss Virginia Wilson; Puerto Rico, Miss Sonia Pereyo; Virgin Islands, Miss Barbara Cochran; District of Columbia, Miss Shirley Akers.

#### EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I have been trying for some time to get the floor. Will the Senator take very long?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask whether or not the bill before the Senate is open to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not at the present time. There is pending an amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When that amendment is disposed of, will the bill then be open to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will then be open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota the only question pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is. Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wish to express the hope that the Senate will be willing to remain in session today until this bill is disposed of. I doubt whether it will be necessary to have an evening session; but if it is necessary I hope Senators will not complain at an evening session. At the moment it seems that we may complete consideration of the bill before that becomes necessary, but I hope Senators will make such arrangements as are necessary if an evening session is required.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ascertain whether, if the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is adopted, further amendments to the bill will be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Out of order, Mr. President, then, I should like to present an amendment and have it printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in my remarks on yesterday I gave my reasons for believing that the bill reported by the committee should be enacted. At that time I made some remarks regarding the number of volunteers and the number of inductees who have come into the Army during the past year or so. I now offer for the Record a complete list, by months, of the volunteers who have come into the Army, beginning with September 1945. The list shows how many enlisted for 1 year, how many enlisted for 18 months, how many enlisted for 2 years, and how many enlisted for 3 years; and it gives the total for each month and the total up to May 21, 1946.

Let me repeat now that enlistments in April 1946 were short 85,000; and when we receive the complete figures for the month of May they will be found to be short 40,000. That makes a total shortage of 125,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall yield in a moment. First, I wish to complete this statement for the Record.

Mr. President, I find from the War Department that through the next 12 months after July 1, 1946, they will have 410,000 men in order that they may, first, discharge all the fathers and, second, comply with the provisions of the committee-recommended bill, namely, that all those with 18 months' service be discharged, and then make up for the attrition which will occur because of the discharge of those who have served 2 years or more. The 410,000 I have mentioned are needed in order to bring the Army to a strength of 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947.

Mr. President, I offer for the Record this tabulation of volunteers, which was prepared for me by the War Department.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### How enlistments are running

[The table below shows the flow of volunteers into the Army by month and term of service. In addition there is shown the number of men inducted each month by Selective Service]

Term of service	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May 1-21 <sup>1</sup>	Total
1 year.....		8,460	58,776	41,929	21,256	11,291	8,443	6,567	3,921	160,643
18 months.....		5,156	29,210	28,457	31,084	36,305	29,203	27,346	10,579	197,340
2 years.....		313	1,307	1,206	2,374	1,579	1,314	1,024	585	9,702
3 years.....	12,093	50,843	95,547	59,392	58,740	43,906	34,639	28,930	17,665	401,655
Total.....	12,093	64,772	184,840	130,984	113,454	93,081	73,499	63,867	32,750	769,340
Inductees.....		37,133	34,107	21,527	34,494	30,780	48,597	43,636	12,000 <sup>2</sup>	251,395

<sup>1</sup> Note that this is for 3-week period.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. STANFILL. What was the total number of volunteers?

Mr. GURNEY. That question has to be answered by saying, first, that most of the inductees, after they enter the service by way of induction, enlist for a specific length of time, in accordance with the bill which Congress passed last fall. In other words, 250,274 men were inducted, beginning in October of last year, with 37,000 in that month, 34,000 in November, and approximately the same number down through the month of April just passed, making a total, as I have said, of approximately 250,000 inductees.

Of course, after the inductees enter the service, approximately 80 percent enlist for the minimum-service period of 18 months. So we find that 197,000 have enlisted for 18 months during the last 7¼ months. One hundred and sixty thousand who had been in the Army for more than 6 months enlisted for 1 year, 9,700 enlisted for 2 years, and 401,655 enlisted for 3 years, making a total enlistment since September of last year of 769,340.

In order to bring the figure up to date, let me say that during the past few months the enlistments have been as follows:

November, 184,000; December, 130,000; January, 113,000; February, 93,000; March, 73,000; April, 63,000; and when we get the figures for May it is estimated that they will reveal that there were no more than 43,000 for the month of May.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. STANFILL. I think it does. Will the Senator state again the total?

Mr. GURNEY. The total is 769,000.

Mr. STANFILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as of what date was that figure?

Mr. GURNEY. Up to May 21, 1946, beginning with the month of September 1945, after VJ-day.

Mr. President, the pending question is an amendment which has committee approval. It is to bring the age down to 18 years and to reinstate the figures provided in the House bill up to May 15, 1945. Adoption of the amendment is necessary because of the passage on May 14, 1946, of Senate Joint Resolution 159, which is Public Law 379, which is the 6-week extension measure, as we know it. The last paragraph of it reads as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act—

The act approved on May 14—

every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

Because of the enactment of that act on May 14, which was subsequent to the committee report on Senate bill 2057 on April 11, adoption of the pending amendment is necessary in order to bring the

age limits to what they were heretofore—namely, 18 to 45—in the original Selective Service Act.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I desire to speak on this amendment.

I had intended to offer an amendment to the bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, so as to make the bill conform to House bill 6064, passed by the House of Representatives, by inserting immediately following line 15, on page 2 of Senate bill 2057, the following:

Sec. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

But upon a careful study I have concluded that by the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 159, as amended by the House of Representatives, extending the Selective Service Act until July 1, 1946, 18- and 19-year-old boys are now exempted from the law. Is that the understanding of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to say that it is not only my understanding, but it is the law, as approved on May 14, 1946, Public Law 379. It specifically provides that only those who are between the ages of 20 and 30 can be drafted.

Mr. STANFILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from South Dakota offered to the pending bill an amendment which provides as follows:

Sec. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 18 and 45 at the time fixed for his registration, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STANFILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota is adopted, would it preclude the offering of an amendment as a substitute for the bill, which would be in absolute opposition to the amendment now pending?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such an amendment can be offered when no other amendment is pending, of course. But a perfecting amendment would take precedence.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The pending amendment is simply a perfecting amendment to the bill; and its adoption would not preclude the offering of an amendment which would strike out the entire text and change the whole bill, as I understand.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, it is my judgment that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] should be rejected by the Senate.

I have consistently supported the foreign policy of our Government in every

vote I have cast in this body, and in offering the amendment I had intended to propose I cannot be accused of being an isolationist. If I thought it were necessary, in order to secure the Army our officers tell us we shall need, I would vote for the inclusion of the teen-age boys in the draft, but I do not believe it is necessary at this time to draft 18- and 19-year-old boys.

Article I, section 8, of our Constitution provides, in part:

The Congress shall have the power \* \* \* to raise and support armies, \* \* \* to provide and maintain a Navy.

Thus, it is up to us. We must not dodge our responsibility, and I will be the last to try to dodge mine. We must meet the question squarely and bravely. But does this mean that we must draft our teen-age boys—boys who will be subject to the terrible conditions which we are told prevail under the drastic court-martial procedure of the military; boys who are still babes, who never had a fling in life, but who are normal and natural individuals who will, in their mischievous ways, become involved in minor trouble, but, under military authority, will be tried like hardened criminals and, if the future is like the past, will be given jail sentences which will ruin their entire lives? To draft these boys would, of course, be the easiest solution to our problem of raising a peacetime Army, but it is not the best solution, nor is it the right solution.

We fought World War I without teen-age boys. It was perhaps necessary to use them in World War II because of the emergency, because of which there was the battle incentive to keep up their morale, but it is not necessary now. We do not use boys in our police force at home. Why send them for police work in Germany and Japan? General Eisenhower said before a congressional committee on April 8:

Frankly, if you can solve this problem without the 18-year-olds, I'm for it.

We have long-term commitments for the peace. That is not a job for drafted boys, but for volunteers, or, at least, for mature men. The first thing to do is to make the voluntary enlistment as attractive as possible. That should have been done long ago. But instead of encouraging volunteers, it seems as though the Army has deliberately tried to discourage them. Only recently the passing grade of volunteers was raised from 59 to 70, or a raise of 11 points. If a grade of 59 was sufficient for the boys who fought all through the war, why is it not good enough for the boys whom the Army wants in its peacetime forces?

The teen-age boys of today are no more "mothers' boys" than are their older brothers. But an extreme emergency justifies extreme measures which none of us care to perpetuate in peacetime. We will call even upon children to help put out a raging fire, but we do not advocate their being regular members of the fire department.

There can be no doubt that the Nation has already lost much in the matter of the development of future leadership, professionally and otherwise, by the compulsory interruption of the normal de-

velopmental and educational processes of our older youth and younger adults. This was a necessary emergency in the war period, but it should not be continued one minute longer than absolutely necessary, if our democracy is to prepare for a peaceful future.

The plunge into full adulthood can better be made than under the tutelage of the typical Army sergeant. Too many of our youth have already had that kind of introduction into adult life, and we shall pay a heavy penalty for the necessity which brought it about.

This does not mean that those of us who call for a different method of approach to this problem do not feel the need for a strong America, and one ready to accept its full responsibility to police the world and work for peace on an international level; far from it, but let us realize that the real secret of future peace lies in learning the ways of international cooperation. During the interim period let us seek for a better way of training a strong American than through complete military control of our youth.

The evidence before the Senate committee shows that a major reason why educators oppose compulsory military training in peacetime is that it would do tremendous injury to our boys. The 18-year-old boy is at a very crucial and impressionable age. Habits and attitudes learned at that age are likely to hold on for a long time. The 18-year-old boy needs the most stabilizing, wholesome, constructive environment possible. In such an environment he develops strength in every way.

In his own home or in a good college the boy has every chance to develop in an all-round way. His education is related to his own life purposes and needs. He has the strengthening support of parents, teachers, relatives, neighbors, friends, churches, young people's clubs, and organizations. He is in an environment which is designed to bring out the noblest and best in him.

In a peacetime Army or Navy camp a boy would have none of those wholesome and stabilizing influences. He would not be an individual of dignity and importance; he would be a recruit, a boot, a "Private Hargrove" without the maturity, sense of humor, or sense of duty which the real Hargrove had.

There is a diametric contrast between conscript service in peacetime and conscript service in time of war. The GI's now in the Army had a splendid morale as long as the enemies of the country stood before them; but now that the enemies are defeated, their morale has degenerated to a sullen resentment against the Army which holds them as unwilling prisoners. Service in the armed forces is an ennobling experience when freemen are fighting the enemies of their country. But compulsory service of teen-age boys in the Army when the Nation is at peace is not conducive to patriotism, morale, or the building of character.

It has been claimed that compulsory military training would improve the health of our boys. I think that there are two ways in which some of them would be improved in health. Those who

do not have enough to eat at home would be well fed; those too poor or too careless to receive medical care and dental care would have examinations and treatment. How much better it would be, however, to provide adequate lunches for all children at all ages in school. How much better it would be to provide in the schools, and even for pre-school children, complete dental and physical examinations every year and follow-up treatment to remove deficiencies among our school children. How much better to provide adequate physical and health education and recreation for all children under competent physical-training experts and health educators. With only a small part of the cost of the proposed training there could be a health program for all children which would produce 20 times as much improvement in the Nation's health.

To take all able-bodied boys at 18 or when they finish high school would be a fatal disruption of the education of the great majority of those who would like to go to college. There has been a great deal of loose thinking on this point. Military men who do not know the facts have been naive enough to say that these boys would go on to college or technical schools anyway after their training. That is simply not true. We have ample facts on this point.

If a boy graduates from high school at 18 he is more than twice as likely to go to college as if he were 19 at graduation. Even of boys who go to college at age 18, about one-third drop out when they become 19. There is a still greater drop-out at age 20, and very few are still in college at 21 or 22. These facts would still be largely unchanged if all boys were required to go to Army camp at 18 or upon high-school graduation. A much smaller number of them would go to college, and the damage to them and to the Nation would be immense.

Persons not familiar with the facts seem to think that all the boys who would have gone to college during this war will now go after they are discharged. That is a seriously mistaken idea, even though the Government is offering tremendous financial inducements for them to pursue their college educations. Of the boys of college age in our present Army and Navy I would guess that not more than two-thirds as many of them will go to college as would have done so if they had not been in the service. A more likely guess would be one-half, even with GI benefits to stimulate them.

A tremendous number of boys and girls who should go to college cannot go now because of their economic inability. It would be a very constructive act for the Federal Government to provide competitive scholarships to encourage a greater number of boys and girls to go to college, and not adopt a program which would cut the number down even further.

The most absurd claim that has been advanced for military training is that it would improve citizenship. Citizenship in a democracy requires individual self-control, not blind obedience to an authority of force. If young boys were required to fulfill 1 year of training under the undemocratic caste system of the

Regular Army and Navy, I will guarantee that crime and irresponsible acts of citizenship will increase tremendously among them after they are released from the artificial and undemocratic control of the military.

We need to strengthen our democratic attitudes, our loyalties to our Nation, and the sense of moral responsibility among our boys. The schools, churches, and colleges are doing a magnificent job of this on the whole. Not many of our criminals come from among college-trained people, or even from among our high-school graduates. But a year of training under military control in a program organized to teach force and killing will undo much of the good which we have been able to accomplish.

I know of no situation more obstructive of learning than the typical military atmosphere. The experience of educators with the training programs of the Army has revealed several fundamental disadvantages in matters of training and education. One of the essential principles of learning is the willingness of the student to learn the Regular Army attitude reverses this principle. Educators know that learning takes place more effectively in a democratic atmosphere in which there is a relationship of mutual respect and human equality between teacher and learner. Our Army and Navy still cling to the Prussian concepts of a military caste and artificial class distinctions between officers and men, especially, in the treatment of recruits. The typical Regular Army attitude is one of fixed ideas and closed-mindedness which is the direct opposite of the learning attitude. As one well-known American is quoted as having said, "The Army never learns, it merely covers up."

For men to work side by side, fight shoulder to shoulder, and face death together in a war for their Nation and their freedom is an experience which frequently strengthens their character and makes them better citizens. But we should never assume that these values would be inherent in a system of conscript training under military authority in time of peace. The two experiences are utterly different, and the injury which a year of compulsory military training in time of peace would do to our younger boys is a major reason against the adoption of such a policy.

One of the very real dangers which we face in American life is the militarization of our youth. That was the way fascism got its start, both in Germany and in Japan. We are eager to see our younger lads raised with a freedom that will not be limited by the cut-and-dried processes of Army discipline. They need self-discipline, to be sure, but the kind the Army gives hinders the development of

such discipline rather than helps it. Especially do both parents and educators feel the great urgency to have our boys delivered from the form of slavery and tyranny over their ideas and habits that Army life inevitably brings.

Notwithstanding the raising of the passing grade from 59 to 70, the Army's records show that up to April 30 there were 736,000 volunteers. I am now told by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the number up to May 21 was 769,000 and that these volunteers were enlisting at a rate of approximately 50,000 a month. Eight months remain in this year, including May, for which we do not have the figures, but at the rate of 50,000 a month we will have an additional 400,000 volunteers, which will make a total of 1,136,000 volunteers by December 31, 1946. It is true the Army says it wants 1,550,000 men as of July 1. But does it not already have them? And at the rate it is receiving volunteers it will have more volunteers by January 1 than it says it will need on July 1, 1947, because the figure it sets up for that date is only 1,070,000 men.

Besides all this, is it not to be assumed that there will be some hundreds of thousands of men taken in the draft who are 20 years of age and over? Where are all the men between the ages of 20 and 30 or 35 years who were deferred from the draft during the war because of the need for their services in war plants?

Of the men deferred other than IV-F's between 20 and 30 years of age, we find 1,183,000 men who are registered and subject to draft. The age groups are as follows:

20 years old.....	81,000
21 years old.....	65,000
22 through 25 years old.....	252,000
26 through 29 years old.....	785,000

Out of this reservoir of 1,183,000 men, not counting IV-F's, together with the volunteers already in the service and joining every day, can there be any question that the Army quota of 1,550,000 men are available without taking the 18-year-old and 19-year-old boys?

I have prepared, from information given me this morning by the office of General Hershey, a table showing the number of registrants, the number in service or demobilized from service, the number of IV-F's, the number of agricultural deferments, the number of industrial and other deferments, and those available for service. I desire to have the table appear in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

	20-year-olds	21-year-olds	22-through-25-year-olds	26-through-29-year-olds	Total
Total registrants.....	1,093,000	1,091,000	4,876,000	4,604,000	11,664,000
In service or demobilized from service.....	785,000	801,000	3,814,000	2,736,000	8,136,000
IV-F's.....	227,000	225,000	810,000	1,083,000	2,345,000
Agricultural deferments.....	27,000	27,000	84,000	237,000	375,000
Industrial deferments.....	12,000	10,000	35,000	318,000	375,000
Other deferments (ministers, conscientious objectors, aliens).....	10,000	9,000	88,000	46,000	153,000
Available for service.....	32,000	19,000	45,000	184,000	280,000
Estimated nonfathers acceptable for service (part of 32,000).....	9,000	5,000	8,000	14,000	36,000

Mr. STANFILL. Moreover, it is undisputed, I believe, that if the Congress will increase the pay of the men in the armed forces to an amount which is adequate, and which I sincerely hope will be done, volunteering will increase very materially.

In the hearings before the committee of the Senate the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] asked General Eisenhower:

You have expressed yourself as in favor of a pay increase for men in the service? It certainly will induce greater volunteering.

General Eisenhower replied:

I should think so; I do not see how it could help but do so.

The bill passed by the House set the minimum age at 20. I believe this to be the sounder policy. Teen-age boys are too immature to meet the problems with which the army of occupation is confronted. They do themselves and this country no good. General Eisenhower has said they do not make good guards. Neither do they make good occupants of draft camps in this country.

In both Europe and Asia they are faced with appalling moral hazards—hazards which have resulted in an incidence of as many as 427 cases per thousand of venereal disease in Germany, according to General McNarney.

They are not much better off in this country, where no adequate safeguards have been taken to protect them against taverns and low dives which especially prey on the teen-age soldier, and where they will have the example of beer in their post exchanges set before them, notwithstanding State laws protect other minors who are not in the Army against such exploitation.

Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article which first appeared, as I understand, in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, but which was reprinted in the Christian Advocate, a Methodist newspaper published in Nashville, Tenn. The article is entitled "Navy Sex Laxity in Japan." At this point I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert the article in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

#### NAVY SEX LAXITY IN JAPAN

(By Chaplain Lawrence L. Lacour, member of Iowa-Des Moines Conference)

Since a large percentage of the Navy are reserves, many of them under 20, and since we chaplains are entrusted with the moral and spiritual welfare of these men, we believe the American public should be informed when conditions and policies exist that jeopardize the morality and faith of our servicemen.

As a policy of venereal-disease control, the Navy is permitting unrestricted access, by all men on liberty in the Yokosuka area, to houses of prostitution where the venereal incidence among the prostitutes is considered 100 percent. The control is the prophylaxis administered by naval corpsmen on duty in the house.

Since September 11, liberty parties have been permitted ashore in this area. Our ship was the first to be granted liberty, and, as we are tied up in the navy yard, I have been able to observe the situation from the beginning. On September 2, the medical officer in charge of venereal control told me that

it would be his policy to supervise the places of prostitution by examining the prostitutes, by segregating those infected, by insisting on cleanliness within the houses, and by establishing adequate numbers of prophylactic stations throughout town.

When liberty parties went ashore men gathered the impression that the medical department had eliminated all immediate danger. Military police and naval corpsmen informed the men in the lines in front of the houses that everything was medically inspected. As a result many enlisted men and officers had sexual contact without using any prophylaxis.

Prior to sending men ashore some ships ran training films on venereal disease, and announced that a high percentage of venereal disease could be expected in Japan. On other ships, the commands refused to discourage promiscuity, and gave no warning about expected venereal incidence.

On September 14 it was disclosed that out of a typical group of prostitutes 51 out of 60 had syphilis, were not being treated, that there would be no further examinations, and that no policy of treatment or segregation would be followed.

Coincidental with Archbishop Spellman's visit here, by September 16 all red-light districts were declared out of bounds. A group of us chaplains inspected the restricted area after a week of suppression. We found that although the method was not totally effective, the number of offenders that got into the restricted area was small.

It was not so easy to suppress the free-lance prostitutes and the smaller houses in the unrestricted area, but there was little open violation. A man intent on sexual contact could find it, but he had to exert considerable effort and run the risk of arrest. Men were treated as usual at prophylactic stations.

At the meeting of the fleet medical officers, on September 26, it was proposed that one large "house" be opened, that it be operated with the understanding that all the women were diseased, and that a voluntary system of prophylaxis be available by placing a Navy operated treatment station within the house. Although some medical officers and two chaplains in attendance protested, it was stated by the senior medical officer that this was to be the policy.

Subsequently the chaplains of the fleet met and submitted to the Flag a memorandum that represented the unanimous opinion of the group. The action of the chaplains was ignored, and Sunday, October 7, the Yosura house was opened to enlisted men, with "geisha houses" permitted to accept the patronage of chiefs and officers.

Although the number of men on liberty next day was considerably under normal because of rain, I observed, in company with four chaplains and the officer of the day of the military police, a line of enlisted men four abreast almost a block long, waiting their turn at the Yosura house. MP's kept the lines orderly, and permitted only as many as could be served to enter at a time. As men were admitted into the lobby, they would select a prostitute (113 on duty that day, according to one of the Japanese attendants), pay the 10 yen to the Japanese operator, and then go with the girl to her room. We inspected several of these rooms and found them reasonably clean.

When the men returned they were registered and administered prophylaxis by Navy corpsmen. Although approximately 20 men could be treated at a time, there was a line waiting. True, many of the men were the type one might expect to patronize such a place, but the bulk of the customers were younger men. The open accessibility of prostitutes in this place has been a factor contributing to the first sex experience of some of my men.

The prostitutes were dirty, highly painted, clothed in gaudy rayon pajamas, some of them with open sores on their faces and feet. Few of them looked intelligent and their appeal could not compare with the lowest street walker in the States.

When one considers the rate of disease, that there are some forms of venereal disease in the Orient that do not respond to treatment, that some of the prostitutes have been exposed to leprosy, that in the evenings these same girls are patronized by Japanese men, it is hard to see any intelligence behind the Navy's policy. Present plans call for the opening of other houses similar to the one just described.

On the basis of these facts, it is contended that:

1. The Navy's policy of unrestricted sexual opportunities with diseased women is no solution for the problem of venereal-disease control.

2. American people should insist that the Navy immediately adopt a policy of rigid suppression in regard to prostitution. (In the light of Japanese culture, an order to Japanese civilian police making it illegal for Japanese women to cohabit with any American personnel would greatly increase the effectiveness of such a measure here.)

3. The Navy, which completely ignored moral implications in the present situation, be charged to consider the moral aspects of policies governing personnel.

4. The people who loan their sons to the Government demand moral protection or refuse to supply the personnel for our armed forces.

5. Although many naval officers are gentlemen, others by example and advice have encouraged immorality among our men.

6. The Navy's unlimited sale of beer, which has contributed to moral delinquency and numerous street incidents, be discontinued. And that throughout the Navy, soft drinks be made just as available as beer whenever beverages are provided by the Navy.

7. An organization that has demonstrated such brilliant strategy in defeating the Japanese military, not permit our men to become the victims of Japanese prostitutes in the final round.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I sincerely believe that the Army can obtain all the men it needs, all the men it says it needs, without drafting 18-year-old and 19-year-old boys. For that reason I shall vote against the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I believe I can state my position on the pending bill briefly and clearly.

I am opposed to military conscription in peacetime.

I am opposed to the use of conscripts in our armies of occupation.

I am particularly opposed to the use of boys in their teens for police duty in the forces of occupation; I might add that, so far as I am concerned, the more quickly our occupation forces are returned from foreign soil, the better I shall feel about the future.

Mr. President, I will admit the discrimination shown in drafting teen-agers in 1945 and 1946, the early months of 1946, and requiring them to serve the prescribed time, but not drafting those who become of draft age in later months of 1946 and 1947. But if we based our decisions on that ground, we never would end conscription, because there always would be that discrimination when conscription ended.

I am aware that the measure which is now before the Senate does not provide

for military conscription as a permanent policy, but calls only for an extension of the Conscription Act, technically, the Selective Service Act, for another year. But I regard it as the opening wedge for permanent peacetime conscription. The same men and the same forces that are backing this extension also are backing the enactment of permanent conscription.

For that reason, I propose to make a few brief remarks in regard to military conscription as a permanent policy.

From the purely materialistic view of winning wars, peacetime conscription has not been noticeably successful. Among modern nations, Napoleon was the first European ruler to adopt it systematically on a nation-wide scale. He won victories for a while; then lost at Waterloo.

However, the defeat at Waterloo was not the severest blow France received. The drain of her young men into the army bled France white. France never recovered from Napoleon's wars of conquest, made possible by military conscription.

In the last two World Wars, France, Italy, Germany, Russia, Japan, and most of the nations of central and eastern Europe relied upon conscription to build up their standing armies, and also to control the minds and the thinking of their peoples, through military indoctrination courses.

Neither the United States nor Great Britain has relied in the past upon peacetime military conscription for its military strength. The United States and Great Britain are the only major nations which emerged victorious from both World Wars. Historically, I cannot see the case for military conscription as an assurance of victory.

However, I do not intend to get into an extended discussion of military conscription, as such, today, except to reiterate that I am opposed to it in principle, and on the ground that it would in the long run weaken, rather than strengthen, our national defense.

What we have to deal with at the present time is the problem of providing the occupation forces abroad to carry out commitments which we are informed the United States has made.

The mission of the armies of occupation is not to fight battles, but to preserve the peace and bring order out of the chaos that is the aftermath of war. That is not a warrior's job. It is a policeman's job, an administrative task.

The courage, the ardor, the recklessness, the hardihood of youth, the willingness to take long chances with dash and abandon that are characteristic of youth, are not the qualities really required for successful administration, police work, and education. Rather, the need is for patience, understanding of how to handle people, coolness, balanced judgment, and experience in getting things done through the exercise of these qualities, rather than in undermining the morale of the enemy by killing, wounding, frightening, and destroying.

The armies of occupation—I am taking it for granted that we have no in-

tention of occupying and ruling the countries and peoples we overcame in World War II—have the mission of encouraging the defeated people to reconstruct their lives along peaceful lines; to reconstruct their shattered cities and factories and transportation systems; to reconstitute themselves as civilians. The objective is to preserve order while this reconstruction is going on; not to fight the enemy, but to aid him in becoming a friendly force in a peaceful world.

Now, such a task as this not only is monotonous for boys in their teens; it is decidedly enervating, and likely to be soul-destroying. Moreover, they are not fitted for this work, excepting those who by instinct take to police and control work, and those probably would volunteer for such service.

I say these teen-age boys, valuable as they are as fighting soldiers when the preservation of the Nation is at stake, are entirely too young and inexperienced for service in armies of occupation. General Eisenhower, my information is, stated this fact in one sentence at the Senate committee hearings: "For occupational duty in foreign lands, I do not believe the 18-year-old boy is as good as the 25-year-old," he is quoted as saying. "Frankly, if you can find a way of solving this without the 18-year-olds I am for it," he said.

Incidentally, I hate to think of what will be the effect of military conscription on the farm youth of the country. Farm life tends to strengthen the initiative and independent thinking of the individual. Military life leads to dependence upon superior authority for weighing factors and making decision; it develops the habit of taking orders and carrying them out blindly.

Furthermore—and this applies to the present and to the immediate future, the months covered by the proposed draft-extension bill—I think Fred Bailey, an official of the National Grange, stated this phase of the situation succinctly and accurately when he said:

Congress should make up its mind definitely now whether it wants the young men from the farms to police the world or feed the world. \* \* \* We have today on the farms the shortest labor force that we have had at any time during the past 5 years.

I say it would be better by far to put young men to work—those that are not in school—in the production and processing and transportation of food, so as to make more food available for export, for relief, and rehabilitation purposes than to draft men to police starving people.

What I have just stated applies to the draft of men of more mature years, as well as to the teen-agers.

I think, also, it is very bad public policy to have young fathers in the Army in peacetime, excepting those who elect to lead that life. It is bad for the fathers, bad for the mothers, very bad for the children. They should be released at the earliest possible moment.

I am perfectly aware of the argument that if the draft is extended, and in-

cludes all young men over 18, this will make possible earlier release of fathers from the Army. But I refuse to admit that extension of the Draft Act is the only way to allow the release of fathers from military service, now that the war is over.

Congress is going to increase the pay of enlisted men in the Army. Other inducements are and will be offered to make the service attractive to those who might prefer life in the Army; and many men would embrace Army life if the United States would do what is done by others who want to get men to work for them, namely, offer pay and conditions which put their occupations in competition with other occupations.

In other words, Mr. President, I am opposed to military conscription in peacetime; I am opposed to the extension of the Draft Act in peacetime even for one more year; but I will support any reasonable program and appropriation necessary to get the requisite number of men through voluntary enlistments.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from an article by Lt. Col. Roscoe S. Conkling, entitled "The Case Against Compulsory Peacetime Military Training." I placed this in the RECORD a little more than a year ago, but consider it pertinent to the subject under discussion, and worth printing again at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE CASE AGAINST COMPULSORY PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

(Colonel Conkling is eminently qualified to write on this subject. In World War I he was the organizer and first director of the draft in New York City. In that war he also served as a lieutenant colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Department, and was one of General Crowder's executive officers at national draft headquarters. He is a former deputy attorney general of the State of New York. He was recommissioned major and later lieutenant colonel, in July 1942, to become a member of the Presidential Appeal Board. He served in that capacity at the National Selective Service headquarters in Washington, D. C., until January 25, 1945, when he returned to inactive status at his own request.)

#### WHY THE REGULAR ARMY AND NAVY URGES IT

The proponents of peacetime compulsory military training among high officers of the Regular Army and Navy are unquestionably well-meaning and loyal Americans. But the human trait of self-interest permeating their advocacy of the project cannot be gainsaid; consequently the value of their advice is decreased, its importance diluted. The greater the number of soldiers and sailors, the greater the number of officers; and with the increase in officer personnel the higher soars the rank of the regular officer with its increased pay and importance. With the expansion of our Army to 10,000,000, or thereabout, regular captains and lieutenants have been promoted to brigadier generals; majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels to major generals, lieutenant generals, and generals. Reduce that army to 1,000,000 or less and, with exceptions here and there, generals again become colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors. Their pay is decreased, their

authority contracted, and their social positions receive a jolting set-back. Is it any wonder that with the ending of hostilities and the demobilization of our armed forces to relatively small peacetime limitations these presently high-ranking regular officers should avidly grasp at any plan which would continue their high pay and place, or at least demote them as slightly as possible? The reduction of base pay, together with longevity accumulations, and incidentals, aggregating six, eight, ten, twelve, or more thousand dollars annually, to base pay of \$333 a month for a colonel, \$300 for a lieutenant colonel, \$250 for a major, and correspondingly reduced "incidentals," cannot be thrust out of mind, however conscientious the effort. The demotion of naval officers likewise takes place, although perhaps not quite so severely, with the reduction of the naval arm from war to peacetime strength. Consequently, the urging of the Regular Establishments of the Army and Navy for compulsory peacetime military training should be viewed in the light of their officers' self-interest when the country is weighing this tremendous project so novel to America. It would, indeed, be wise if Regular Army and Navy officers refrained entirely or were prohibited from joining in any way in the promotion of this general proposition, except upon request of Congress. Certainly all efforts in which they are now directly and indirectly indulging to effect legislation favoring it should cease at once. They cannot possibly forget their self-interest, for subconscious of it they must be, however sincere their desire for the Nation's welfare.

#### TEN MILLION SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' LIPS ARE SEALED

Recently revised Army regulations provide that "except as authorized by the War Department, efforts by any person in the active service of the United States \* \* \* to procure or oppose or in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army \* \* \* are forbidden."

In other words, if the Army, which today is in truth the War Department, will permit it, a commissioned or noncommissioned officer or a private may speak out publicly in opposition to peacetime compulsory military training. If it will not authorize free discussion, the lips of every man and woman of the 10,000,000 or more comprising the United States armed forces are sealed. Yet the Secretaries of War and Navy and their assistants, members of the General Staff, and other high ranking officers are free to promote and propagandize at will, often at Government expense, for the enactment of this proposed law. And it is a peacetime not wartime measure affecting, after their demobilization, perhaps disastrously for many years to come, the lives and living as well as the purses of our citizen soldiery now held incommunicado, their children, and kin; while most of those, themselves so vocal but enforcing the silence of their opposition, will be the enriched beneficiaries of the legislation they so desperately sponsor. There can be little doubt as to the War Department's attitude if authorization to oppose is sought by any serviceman. As a matter of fact this writer, through channels, sought of his commanding general, in writing, not approval or endorsement of his opposition to compulsory military training, but merely his superior's formal expression that he had no objection to such being publicly set forth. It is known that his application was received and discussed with other staff officers, but it was not forwarded to the War Department for its authorization and probably found its way into the wastebasket—for nothing has been heard of it since.

If American doctrine and tradition are not to be completely destroyed, we should con-

tinue to keep the military out of the law-making which orders our peacetime living.<sup>1</sup> Such has been our way since the founding of the Republic and such has been demonstrated to be the way to keep the United States of America the leading, most beloved nation on earth; and this notwithstanding when forced into war, but only then, it becomes the most feared. When called upon, its hosts of civilian soldiery sweep their enemies before them, establish peace, and at once return to their peacetime pursuits, despising war and warmaking.

#### WHY RESERVE AND SPECIALIST OFFICERS APPROVE IT

At first signs of gathering war clouds over America the War and Navy Departments began their hurried enlargement of administrative personnel, and thousands of civilians have been commissioned. These officers have been so rapidly promoted, often almost automatically every 6 months, that throughout all the service commands and especially within the military district of Washington, we now have a mighty host of generals, colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors; naval captains, commanders, lieutenant commanders, and lieutenants. Many never see front-line or even field-training service at home, although some spend a few weeks taking an indoctrination course which is usually more or less a useless procedure, for upon its completion they promptly return to their desks in the Navy Department and in such sections of the Army as the Quartermaster's, Finance, Adjutant General's, Air Force, Provost Marshal General's, Judge Advocate General's, Selective Service (National and State), etc. They make up the greater part of the officers seen in uniform-wearers centers such as our large cities and especially in Washington itself. And, incidentally, observing the unusually large number of newly made administrative Army and Navy officers appearing on the streets of the Nation's Capital, and elsewhere, one wonders why so many of this multitude holding commissioned rank and performing office duties are and have been from the beginning of their service well within the younger brackets of the draft ages. Certainly a great majority, when first commissioned, were and probably are now between the ages of 21 and 31, or 35 at most, while not so fortunate men between 35 and 45 with dependent families and settled and important home-community interests have been inducted into the armed services in droves.

Great numbers of these young men hold ordinary office jobs, mostly of a clerical nature, and have been recruited from every vocation and from every section of the country: real-estate agents and insurance men, salesmen and customer's men from stock and bond houses, bank clerks, haberdashery, textile, footwear, and other salesmen, lawyers and Government clerks. Numerous indeed are young Federal employees from the various Government departments who were on the ground when draft agitation began in Congress and knew the ropes as to the securing of commissions, or how to locate and get the desirable assignments for the duration if they had already, since the last war,

<sup>1</sup> President Wilson on July 8, 1918, at the beginning of the great American offensive of World War I at Belleau Wood and Chateau Thierry, sharply reminded the American people: "A very fundamental principle of our institutions is that the military power is subordinate to the civil"; that the armed forces of the country must be instruments of the civilian authority which determines the Nation's policies, and that this was the idea of the framers of the Constitution he sought to perpetuate.

been endowed with the status of Reserve officers.

For these Army and Navy officers the armed services are indeed glamorous and lucrative. It is probably true that the majority of them receive a far greater net income than their civilian jobs ever afforded in fact or in contemplation. Coupled with this is the exhilaration of receiving a military salute from every private, noncommissioned, and lower-ranking officer of all arms of the services they happen to pass on the highway, constantly reminding them and confirming their satisfaction at knowing they are labeled and recognized as superior by so many of their fellow men. Of course, they live in comfort, far from the dreaded battlefields. That is militarism; one side of it, the easy side. And it is among this grouping of our unarmed forces that the prospect of universal military service is so attractive and so worth insisting upon for the good of the Nation, and, incidentally, for the possibility that they themselves will be retained in a new military structure and avoid going back home, minus the striking and labeling uniform, to work at the prosaic old job where superiority must be demonstrated by merit and in free fields open to all competitors.

The desk officers of the Army and Navy, Regular, specialist, and Reserve, know full well compulsory universal military training will necessitate a huge personnel of high rank to maintain a peacetime Army and Navy of a million or more boys, added to the enlarged Army and Navy we shall undoubtedly maintain for many years after this war. And therein lies their chance of retention in their present high pay and place jobs or, at worst, possibly a mild demotion.

#### ARMY AND NAVY PROPONENTS TAKING ADVANTAGE OF WAR FERVOR

Probably the unfairness aspect of the effort to force compulsory military training upon us is the strategy of its proponents: somehow to get legislation for it quickly passed while we are in the midst of war enthusiasm—or hysteria, when everyone is working hard for victory, and countless numbers are worrying about their loved ones or suffering from the bereavements of war. They know that at the conclusion of hostilities the millions of actual fighting men won't want to listen to agitation for more soldiering. Their first thought will be to forget their harrowing experiences and be freemen again, not uniformed robots to be told where and when and what, 24 hours a day. That unquestionably will be the attitude of those who come back to us whole in body and sound of mind. Of the others—"Well, always thinking or talking about it will do no good. That was yesterday, last month, last year. Thank God it's over." Those of us who experienced the aftermath of World War I are entirely familiar with that point of view of returning fighting men. War stories will be rejected without demur by book and periodical publishers. Motion pictures with war plots or even short war scenes will become taboo. Consequently, after the hysteria of actual warfare has subsided compulsory peacetime military training legislation can receive Nation-wide and thoughtful consideration by our civilian population with both sides of the proposition fully developed. Informed and free opponents of it will be available who can testify from knowledge and experience as to the horrors and uselessness of peacetime and fanatical youth militarization among our enemies, from which we may judge its inevitable results if forced upon the boyhood of the United States. At least we shall not be rushed pell-mell into this monstrous de-Americanizing project by the one-sided, opposition-crushing, and self-interested campaigning of a comparatively few

high rankers of the Army and Navy, aided by well-financed civilian groups such as those who profit fabulously by the sale of military products; uniforms and other prescribed wearing apparel, quartermaster's supplies, constantly obsolescing air, sea, and ground vehicles, armaments, etc.; and aided also by that hidden and ruthless alien movement—call it what you will—the leadership of which has not yet been identified, but which is spreading its tentacles throughout the land and seeks to strangle our tried and revered American ways and manner of free, peaceful, and prosperous living.

America fights, how well our enemies twice within a quarter of a century and to their sorrow have learned, when it has to, or is dragged into war. But it is not a warrior nation and certainly, in its normal life, frowns dourly upon grandiose militaristic activity, yet its doctrines and traditions have proved the most successful of all the nations of history.

#### THE SELF-INTERESTED PROPAGANDA AGENCIES EARLY AT WORK

It would be interesting to know how many heads or groups in various sections of the War and Navy Departments, with or without the sanction or encouragement of the Secretaries or their assistants, with or without the support of certain members of the General Staff, or, indeed, with or without the nod of the President himself, have long been busily engaged in developing plans and propaganda for the introduction of legislation now; for a law requiring a year or more of compulsory military training of American boys between 18, 19, and 20 years old, to be begun as demobilization of our returning fighting forces gets under way.

Publicity was not only discouraged but darkly frowned upon within one Washington military department while several nonfighting colonels, naval captains, and commanders who, although charged with urgent duties pertaining to the daily progress of this war, spent most of their time during a recent period conferring, discussing, and drafting legislation for compulsory military training, and by no process of reasoning could this activity be regarded as within their jurisdiction or line of duty. The project actually had been under consideration since May 1943—perhaps even before then. These Regular, Specialist, and Reserve Army and Navy officers worked diligently during July and August of 1944 in order to have something definite and in print to submit to one of the Army's most publicized nonfighting major generals upon his return from a tour of the country, during which he sponsored, cautiously, in public speeches, the compulsory military training idea. Whether this was by direction of his superiors or on his own initiative is not known. But, previous to his departure, he had quietly charged this selected few of his staff with the preparation of a bill to be made ready for quick presentation to Congress. Incidentally, this "law-making" body undoubtedly entertained no other idea in their completed proposals than that this major general should be named the Director of Universal Military Training. And the most enthusiastic of his legally unauthorized bill-drafting coterie were no doubt convinced that they would continue with him indefinitely in supervising the compulsory military training of our youngsters long after World War II armies had been disbanded and their components were back at their jobs making a living—and figuring out how to pay the taxes staring at them from the future, in addition to paying a tremendous price for the militarizing of their teen-aged sons. The estimate of annual cost for the training of these youngsters arrived at by the major general's "planners" was from one to one and one-half billion dollars per million trainees; about \$1,000 to \$1,500 "a head."

Who directs this attempted transportation of old-world peacetime military servitude to free America; this revival and modernization of medievalism? It undoubtedly does not spring from the minds and hearts of even a substantial number of our national legislators. While at least two bills pertaining to it were introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, they were permitted to slumber undisturbed for months. The subject was "too hot at the moment" is reported to have been observed by some Congressmen before the November elections. Shortly after the election recess a special committee of the House was appointed and announced it would begin hearings on compulsory military training within a few days. A flood of church, labor, and other opposition appeared. The militarists' demand for haste was somewhat offset temporarily and the House committee chairman, the day after Thanksgiving, decided that the committee would be unable to complete hearings in 1944; that the measure would have to go over for consideration by the new Congress convening in January 1945. Representative WADSWORTH and a few others, when not urging complete regimentation of all Americans via national service legislation, discourse in patriotic banalities on the "mental, physical, and civic" value of the militarization of our youth. But the legislators of the outgoing Congress generally appeared to be occupied with more important items having to do with the welfare of the Nation at war, not peacetime militarization of its boyhood.

A poll of Fortune magazine last July purported to indicate public favor for peacetime drafting of boys as they become 18 years of age. Who inspired this poll at that time or how much thoughtful opinion is involved is, of course, problematical. Concurrently with the issue of Fortune the Director of Selective Service, before the Commerce and Industry Association in New York City, adroitly turning to the importance of "conditioning and training youth for the future national defense" following a discussion of the rejection of registrants in draft operations in this and World War I, remarked that so long as "Selective Service has custody of the greatest inventory of manpower America has ever made" it must collaborate in every possible way to insure that "by training and rehabilitation more men can assume the entire burden of citizenship." A dainty morsel tossed out to test its palatability.

A few weeks later Colonel McDermott, director of selective service for New York City, appeared before the microphone and urged adoption of military peacetime training in a public radio debate. A prominent minister of one of the city's churches opposed him. This draft official's stereotyped theme was "national security, national health and welfare" and inculcation of the democratic spirit by "its powerful influence in breaking down and eliminating racial, religious, and class barriers and prejudices." His exhortations followed the usual pattern which seems to have been designed especially for the proponents of youth training in their stealthy but ever bolder advocacy of militarizing the Nation. Then, in a heroic effort to tell us why we should at once undertake this form of un-Americanism, he delivered himself of this novel and profound thought: "History and the frailties of human nature have taught us that war may come again."

Following this broadcast debate by the director of selective service for New York City, the New York Herald Tribune published a Washington correspondent's story telling us that "selective service officials, planning for any postwar compulsory military training system which might result from pending legislation, were disclosed to favor administration of such a program by a joint Army-Navy board . . . and if Congress does choose to give control of universal service to such a board, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the draft

director, and some of his present staff might want to stay on, selective-service officials said."

The gently persuasive emanations of high-ranking selective-service officers, however, made no noticeable impression upon the country at large; bolder urging became necessary. On September 26 the Director of Selective Service abandoned his dulcet and generalized approvals of the measure and boldly told the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce he was "heartily in favor of peacetime military training," and dangling the scarecrow "defense" before his audience, warned:

"Today's warfare has changed in a manner that the risk of unpreparedness is tantamount to courting disaster. Our national growth requires manpower and armament in adequate numbers and quality to protect it from sudden aggression. . . . Relief from this training should be permitted only in cases where extreme physical or mental conditions exist."

In other words every American boy who can walk without crutches or is not a congenital imbecile, must leave his job or school and go to military training camp for a year or more when he becomes 18 or 19 years old; irrespective of whether he is the sole or partial support and comfort of a widowed mother or a physically or mentally incapacitated father, or necessary to aid in feeding and clothing younger brothers and sisters and thus help keep intact an American family unit; irrespective of whether he is needed on the typically American little farm which produces our food and which his father and mother have worked drudging years to develop, irrespective of breaking into the required hours of apprenticeship he's been building to become a journeyman machinist, plumber, carpenter, tinsmith, or other tradesman; irrespective of interfering with his preparation for law, medicine, engineering, dentistry—and this is not in war but in peacetime. Thus the Director of Selective Service put officially and squarely before his Buffalo listeners the idealistic proposals of the militarist minded of America who are urging to the utmost universal compulsory military training—for the good of America, or in their own personal interest?

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter to me from Elizabeth A. Smart, president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and a statement from the WCTU, stating their opposition to extension of the Draft Act, and particularly to conscription of boys under 20 years of age.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN  
TEMPERANCE UNION,  
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1946.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The Senate bill to extend the draft (S. 2057) is on the calendar for action Monday, June 3. May we be permitted very respectfully to present a few facts regarding it for your consideration.

This bill continues the draft age at 18. The bill recently passed, extending the draft to July 1, set the minimum age at 20. We believe this to be the sounder policy. Teen-age boys are too immature to meet the problems with which the Army of occupation is confronted. They do themselves and this country no good. General Eisenhower has said they do not make good guards. Neither do they make good occupants of draft camps in this country.

In both Europe and Asia they are faced with appalling moral hazards, hazards which have resulted in an incidence of as much as

427 cases per thousand of venereal disease in Germany, according to General McNarney. The situation in Japan is described in the enclosed article by Chaplain LaCour. They are not much better off in this country, where no adequate safeguards have been taken to protect them against taverns and low dives which especially prey on the soldier, and where they will have the example of beer in their post exchanges set before them, although State laws protect minors against such exploitation.

In spite of all the clamor of propaganda with which the press is being filled by Army and administration influence, please remember that the Gallup poll showed a 60-percent public approval of the 20-year minimum age limit, and only 33 percent opposed.

The Army will, by its own figures, have not a deficit, but a surplus, over the 1,070,000 men required by July 1, 1947, with plenty of replacements to release all fathers by September 1946, and all draftees by February 1947. They will not be replaced any sooner by continuing the draft. I enclose breakdown of figures.

Enlistments are still coming in at 50,000 or more a month in spite of an apparent decrease caused by the Army raising requirements from 59 to 70, March 1, causing the rejection of 3 out of 7, instead of 1 out of 7. The 50,000 is the number being accepted.

May we not most respectfully, but most earnestly urge you to vote for a 20-year minimum age limit. And a draft holiday.

Very respectfully,

NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN  
TEMPERANCE UNION,  
By ELIZABETH A. SMART.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN  
TEMPERANCE UNION

The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union at its last convention adopted the following statement on legislation:

We oppose:

2. Peacetime conscription of men, women, or youth.

There is a fundamental reason for our opposition. While the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to raise and support armies, this gift of power is distinctly limited by the further proviso that "no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years," and while it provides in article II of the amendments that "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

It further provides that (art. III):

"No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner."

And it expressly reserves to the States the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia (art. I, sec. 8, No. 16).

It is contrary to the custom and spirit of American life and the American Constitution to maintain armies of conscripted soldiers except in the dire emergency of war. That Constitution was drafted and our American custom was originated by men who had learned from bitter experience the dangers of government-impressed armies in the enslavement of peoples, and who were determined to safeguard this country against that danger.

We do not believe that that danger is past today. In fact, from the recent experiences of those Axis Nations whom we have just defeated, we believe it is greater than ever.

The traditions laid down by our ancestors have been proved in the crucible of time and found sound. It is not accidental that today the United States of America is one of the two greatest nations on earth nor that as the

arsenal of democracy we were the chief factor in the winning of World War II.

It is human and natural for those in charge of the armed services to see in compulsion the necessary ingredient for the success of their defense program. Men in the armed services think in terms of force. Yet, even those gentlemen say they would prefer a volunteer army. There would appear to be considerable evidence that compulsion as a means of producing men for the services is about running out. A statement given out to the Associated Press by selective service on April 1 estimates that they will probably be unable to fill an increased April demand for 125,000 men. Contrast this with the 652,099 men already raised by voluntary enlistment as of March 21, although the Army testified some time ago that they would be unable to get 300,000 by voluntary methods by July 1 of this year.

It appears that there is no dispute that the 1,550,000 men will on hand as required as of July 1, 1946. The Army only says that it fears a shortage of some 170,000 men as of July 1, 1947, if their estimates as to the number of men procurable by voluntary methods without the draft are correct. In view of the fact that their estimates were off 50 percent, or 300,000 men, on the number they could procure by voluntary enlistment by July 1, 1946, it is not unreasonable to suppose they may have underestimated by at least 170,000 men as of July 1, 1947.

Since the above statement, we have the figure of 747,899 men who have enlisted as of May 14. Members of the General Staff testified before Senate Military Affairs Committee in January that they would release all but 120,000 fathers on the basis of expected enlistments of 650,000 by July 1. Since they have enlistments of 747,899 by May 14, with enlistments coming in at the rate of 11,000 weekly, they will have enough enlistments additional to the 650,000 to take care of the 120,000 fathers who could have been released with an enlisted total of 650,000.

With more than 1,550,000 as of July 1, 1946, and enlistments running more than 50 percent over their original estimate of 300,000, and somewhere in the neighborhood of 164,000 ahead of the estimate of 650,000, it would appear very likely that instead of being 170,000 short by July 1, 1947, of the 1,070,000 men required, the Army will have a surplus on that date.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the amendment which is the pending question, I understand does not in fact change the purpose of the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota. It is a clarifying amendment, under which all persons between certain ages are made subject to draft and will be drafted into service during the next year.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from West Virginia has referred to the bill as one introduced by the Senator from South Dakota. Let me say to the Senator that this is a committee-approved bill. I am reporting it for the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. I referred to it as the Senator's bill only because he is reporting it for the committee.

Mr. President, I will at the proper time offer an amendment as a substitute for the whole bill now pending. The substitute will provide for suspending the

drafting of all persons of all ages. I take the view that it is not necessary to draft anyone. I have not at any time drawn any distinction as to ages. Some have believed that individuals of certain ages should be drafted and individuals of certain other ages should be exempt. I have not subscribed to that idea at all. I expect to point out to the Senate at the proper time that there is no necessity for continuation of the draft at this particular time, and that the Congress itself should determine when drafting should be resumed. Drafting should be resumed only upon order of the Congress.

I may say that the amendment which I shall offer will extend the Selective Service Act; that when boys come to the age of 18 they will be obliged to register and will be subject to call when the Congress says there is sufficient reason to call up more men.

My substitute amendment is based upon the idea of obtaining a volunteer force. At the proper time I expect to point out to the Senate facts and figures to show that there is today no necessity to continue the induction of men. There is necessity for the extension of the selective-service law because of the other features of that law.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall have to vote against the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota for the reason that it does draft persons into the Army and does not suspend the draft. In due time, when I can properly offer the substitute amendment, which is printed and is on the desks of Senators, I shall speak to that proposition. In the meantime, the question being presented upon the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, I find that I must vote against it, as it is in conflict with the amendment which I shall later offer.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hawkes	Overton
Andrews	Hayden	Pepper
Austin	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Ball	Hill	Reed
Barkley	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Huffman	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burch	Knowland	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stanfill
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Taft
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	Magnuson	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wheeler
Fulbright	Moore	Wherry
George	Morse	White
Gerry	Murdock	Wiley
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	
Hart	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on the bill

generally—not on any particular amendment. I have several amendments on my desk which I expect to offer later, but I wish to say a few words about the bill.

As is usually the case, the bill as it came from the committee was the result of a compromise. The committee worked diligently upon the bill, and there was a sharp division of opinion within the committee. It was contended by one group in the committee that we could depend entirely upon volunteers. Another group looked pessimistically at the statistics pertaining to volunteers and felt that we would be taking a grave chance if we were to depend altogether upon volunteers. Those two differing opinions were worked into the bill which is now before the Senate.

I think I should state my position on the question of the draft. It is not a position which I have assumed today. It is a position which I assumed many months ago, and which I have worked hard in the committee, as members of the committee will testify, to have enacted into the law of the land.

For a long time I have contended that if the draft were extended from May 15 to July 1, in full force and effect, just as it operated previous to May 15, the draft could be entirely dispensed with after July 1.

I based my opinion and reached that conclusion on the basis of simple arithmetic—addition and subtraction. Approximately 200,000 men could have been inducted into the military service between the dates of May 15 and July 1, and those 200,000 men would have formed a cushion so that the country could very safely have depended upon the volunteer system from July 1 on. At least, that is my contention.

The Senate will recall that while we were debating the British loan the deadline of midnight May 14 approached, and that the Senator from Colorado introduced a Senate joint resolution on the floor of the Senate, which extended the draft until July 1, or for a period of 6 weeks. That extension provided for the draft as it was previous to May 15, and made no exceptions.

However, after the Senate agreed to it by unanimous vote, it went to the House, and the House struck from it the provision drafting all teen-age boys. Of course, that had the effect of making it practically inoperative insofar as bringing men into the service was concerned. It merely extended the machinery. It is estimated by the Selective Service System that from May 15 to May 31 it would bring approximately 2,000 draftees into the service, and the estimate is that for the entire month of June it will bring in approximately 10,000 men. That would make a total of 12,000, as against a total potential, had the bill been enacted and in full force, of 200,000, or, perhaps, a number somewhat less than that. Of course, that situation throws the mathematics of the matter entirely out of line. Because of that fact, the Senator from Colorado made an effort to work out a compromise bill for the extension of the draft which would do the least violence to the volunteer system.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the amendment which the Senator

from Colorado offered in the committee, and which the committee very graciously and generously accepted. The majority sentiment in the committee was against the position of the Senator from Colorado, but the committee did agree to that amendment. It was the best compromise which supported my point of view that I could get from the committee, and I think it is a very effective measure. I understand that the Senator from West Virginia stated a moment ago that he will offer an amendment to extend the draft for 1 year, but to make it ineffective and inoperative insofar as the induction of men is concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator realizes, of course, that the purpose of extending the Selective Service Act is, first, to save to the veterans the rights they have as to priority of employment, and, second, to take care of the situation in respect to the law which deals with the seizure of industries which are closed because of strikes. Another reason for extending the Selective Service Act and for stopping inductions is—and when the Senator says my amendment would make it ineffective, I trust he will bear this in mind—that an extension of the Selective Service Act, under the plan which I shall submit to the Senate, would have boys continue to register when they become 18 years of age; the selective-service machinery would be kept intact, and if the Congress found that the national necessity called for it, the Congress could immediately enact provision for inductions and could bring about an inducted army again, if it were found that the volunteer method would not work.

I may say that I wish to have a volunteer Army. We are moving fast toward having one. But we shall never get one by having an Army partly made up of volunteers and partly made up of inducted men.

So when the Senator says my amendment would make it ineffective, I disagree with him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator misunderstood me. I said it would make inductions inoperative. That statement is correct.

I am glad the Senator from West Virginia has stated his position and has advanced the arguments on behalf of his amendment, which are clearly sound. The points he has made are well taken. I merely said that under his amendment the induction of men would be inoperative.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to call attention to my amendment, which I think would do exactly the same thing the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia would do. My amendment is already incorporated in the bill. I refer now to section 2 of the Senate bill 2057, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. The fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Provided fur-

ther, That on July 1, 1946, the number of men in active training or service in the Army shall not exceed 1,550,000, and that this number shall be reduced consistently month by month so that the Army's strength shall be 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947."

Then the bill makes a provision with respect to the Navy, and then it makes the following further provision:

And provided further, That the monthly requisitions on the President under this act by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made. The men inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service under this act shall be assigned to camps or units of such forces.

That language simply means that we are writing into the law a limitation on the size of the Army as of July 1, 1946, and as of July 1, 1947, and we are making a graduated reduction, which amounts to 40,000 a month, from the figures of 1946 to the total of 1947. Under this provision the Army will be reduced 40,000 a month, and no one will be inducted if we obtain a sufficient number of volunteers. I have confidence that there will be plenty of volunteers, and especially do I have such confidence if the Senate wisely adopts the wage schedule measure which the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Colorado will give the Senate an opportunity to vote on very shortly. If we increase the pay, especially the pay of the men in the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades, I think there will be plenty of volunteers. I have absolute confidence that there will be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like very much to believe that the Senator's optimism is justified, because I totally prefer a volunteer Army in peacetime. But let me ask the Senator the question which troubles me: What would he do if it developed that his optimism were unjustified and that there were not sufficient volunteers to supply the minimum indispensable quota. Then what would the Senator do?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, under the provisions of the bill, what the Senator would do would be to induct, through the draft, through selective service, the necessary numbers that would be required.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is not that what the pending bill provides?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what the pending bill provides. I am speaking in behalf of the pending bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well, I beg the Senator's pardon; I thought he was presenting an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado cannot be very persuasive if that sort of an understanding has come about. I am saying now that section 2 of this bill does precisely what the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from West Virginia would do, except that if our optimism is found not to be well based, if the volunteers do not come in, if we are unable to obtain sufficient vol-

unteers, then the draft will be used, under section 2 of this bill. That is the difference between the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia and the language of the bill.

I do not believe that the pessimism concerning the volunteer Army is supported by the facts. I believe that we have done very well so far in developing a volunteer Army, the largest volunteer Army, as I understand, this Nation has ever had. I recall that last October the War Department, including all its generals, as well as the Secretary of War, estimated that the total number of volunteers whom we could obtain between October 1945 and July 1, 1946, was 300,000. The total now is estimated to be 800,000. The Senator from South Dakota stated a moment ago that it is, as I recall, 769,000.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct; 769,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As of May 15.

Mr. GURNEY. May 21.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. May 21. The 800,000 mark will not be missed very far. I presume the number will just about reach 800,000. We must remember that the total about which we are talking, namely, 1,550,000, includes also officers.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator must bear in mind, however, that of the 769,000 whom we now class as volunteers, many came into the Army originally through selective service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. After they were sworn in they then volunteered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. GURNEY. It is conservatively estimated that of the 197,000 who enlisted for 18 months, 18 percent came in through selective service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but many had had no service in the Army before they enlisted for the 3-year terms.

Mr. GURNEY. No; these are men who enlisted for 18 months; and not 3 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, I see. Less than 5 percent came into the service for 18 months. That is a very small group. The greater number of men comprise those who enlisted for 3 years and 1 year.

Mr. GURNEY. Up to May 21, starting with September of last year, there were 160,643 1-year men; 197,340 18-month men, 9,702 2-year men, and 401,655 3-year men. Of course, some of the 3-year men came in through selective service. Some of them had already seen service, liked the Army, and wanted to continue to serve in it. But out of the 197,000 18-month men, approximately 80 percent, came into the Army through selective service. The correct grand total would be 767,700.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I misunderstood the Senator. I am sorry. That makes a difference.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, we know that the men who have enlisted

for 3 years represent 53 percent of the enlistees, or of the figure of 769,340.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, that is what the War Department told us.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I believe that approximately 27 percent enlisted for 18 months, and approximately 23 percent or 24 percent enlisted for a year. Allow me to point out to the Senator that those men who enlisted for a year already had had 8 months of service in the Army, or they would not have enlisted for a year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So the only ones who enlisted under any pressure of the draft are those who have enlisted for 18 months. Is that not correct? A man would not enlist for 3 years under the pressure of the draft when he could enlist for 18 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, but he might enlist for a year in order to have a definite date of discharge.

Mr. REVERCOMB. He has already served for 6 months, and he is already in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. He has not enlisted because of any fear of being drafted into the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; but he might volunteer because desiring a definite date of separation. The Senator is correct in his reference to 3-year men, and I believe also in reference to the 2-year men. I believe the men who volunteered for 2 years did so because of the attitude, "Well, we will wait until the end of 2 years. Then maybe we will continue." They are Army-career men. The men who volunteered for 18 months and 1-year may have done so in order to have a definite date of separation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much impressed by the statement of the able Senator from South Dakota that approximately 80 percent of the 18-month men had not had previous military service. I understand it to be an estimate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I think it should be said with respect to that statement that the condition is not an unusual one, and I am not surprised at it. Eighty percent of the men who volunteered have had military service, and they like it and want more of it, so they volunteered for more of it. Twenty percent of them, however, came from civilian ranks. I do not see that that proves anything with regard to the volunteer system. I think it proves that the volunteer system is working very well. The basis for the volunteer system is its appeal to men who love the Army, who wish to make the Army their career. If 80 percent of them have had military service and like the Army, it is a fine thing, and it is a compliment to the Army. It proves nothing against the volunteer system, but instead supports it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish again to make a brief reference to the men coming into the Army from selective service. A total of 250,000 men came in since October of last year. That was about 8 months ago. It has been figured out

that most of those men immediately upon coming into the Army through the selective service enlisted. In other words, they volunteered for enlistment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What are the 250,000? I wish the Senator would identify them. I do not know what he is talking about.

Mr. GURNEY. That is the number of men who came in through selective service during the past 8 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. During the past 8 months?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. The point I wish to make is that as soon as they came in through selective service they then volunteered for 18 months of service so that they might have a definite date of discharge in front of them. The other point I wish to make is that those who had been in the Army for 6 months had the privilege of enlisting for 1 year so that they could have a definite date of discharge.

Those who enlisted for 1 year under the law passed last October will have to start getting out of the Army 2 or 3 months in advance of their discharge date. In other words, if they are in Japan they should start home 60 days in advance, and possibly from Germany 6 weeks or perhaps 60 days. So in November of this year we know that the Army will have to discharge 58,000 men. Consequently the Army has to get ready; it has to have replacements in order to start the 58,000 back. They will have to start them back in the latter part of September or the early part of October.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is one way they can take care of 40,000, and that is by the reduction of the Army. That will take care of 40,000, leaving 18,000.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct; but 1-year enlistments are definitely terminating, starting this fall—September and October. I merely wanted to call that to the Senator's attention.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That, of course, is correct. There is no argument about that.

I wish to say, furthermore, with respect to our pessimism about the volunteer system that during the month of May, up until May 21, the first 3 weeks in May, 33,000 men volunteered. It is estimated that during the last 10 days of May 10,000 more will have come in. So they are entering in goodly numbers. I do not know the number who will enlist during June.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Colorado whether, during the period of time the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Military Affairs, consideration was given to the fact that the Army would not reinduct the men who had already had prior military service. I had prepared an amendment which I had hoped would be accepted, and I still hope it will be accepted by the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor

of the Senate. It provides that on page 2, lines 18 to 25, be stricken out, and on page 3, lines 1 through 5, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the following:

(a) Each man heretofore or hereafter inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall, unless sooner discharged, serve for a training and service period of 18 months, less the aggregate period of time he may have served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States, including service as a cadet at the Military Academy and services of midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is one matter to which the committee did not give attention. However, I am told that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has offered today an amendment to take care of that point, and I have also prepared one. My amendment has been prepared through the legislative council, and the attorney of Selective Service, Colonel Renfro. While it differs slightly from the amendment which has been offered or will be offered by the Senator from California, its objective is exactly the same.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that so far as I am concerned there is no pride of authorship in the amendment. So long as the job is done, I do not care whose amendment does it, but I think the point should be covered, so the men who have had service will not be reinducted into the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree completely with the Senator; and there is no pride of authorship with respect to my amendment. As a matter of fact, I am not the author if it, I did not write one word of it. The attorneys in the legislative counsel's office wrote it, and it was submitted to the attorney for Selective Service, Colonel Renfro, who is a very able man, in whom I have great confidence as to his ability and in every other way. He went over the amendment and offered some suggestions, and the net result is the amendment which I intend to offer on the point raised by the Senator from California. I presume that those who have worked on the amendment have considered the whole problem and the way it should be solved.

Mr. President, I desire to give the Senate a break-down of the military manpower for the Army on July 1, 1946, and July 1, 1947.

I think that in order to understand this whole problem we should set out a balance and make an analysis of what the Army will consist on each of these dates. I have tried to be very careful, I have tried to be very conservative, in the figures I have prepared. Quite naturally, the figures pertaining to July 1, 1947, must, by their very nature, be to some extent speculative.

Let us consider the July 1, 1946, figures. I should be very happy to have any Senator criticize the figures, and point out, if he can, where any error exists.

First, the required strength is 1,550,000 men. Congress did not set that figure; that is an estimate the War Department itself determined. That is the estimate of the required strength as set forth by the War Department. Congress had nothing whatever to do with the figure, and I am presuming that it

is correct. My own private opinion is that perhaps it could be cut to some extent; but I am not suggesting that other than to indicate that that is my private opinion.

My reason for the statement is that I find that in Alaska there are more soldiers now than there were a year ago, that there are more in the Caribbean than there were a year ago, that there are more in other places than there were a year ago, and I doubt the necessity of the number stated; but I do not intend to argue that point. We accept the Army's own figures as to their own requirements as being 1,550,000, and we have written that number into the bill. That is the first time it has ever been written into proposed legislation. In this bill that figure is written.

According to the Army themselves, they say they will need 150,000 officers. I point out to Senators that these 150,000 officers are all volunteers. As a matter of fact, if it were left to the officers themselves to say whether they wanted to be in the Army, the Army could have twice that number. They could easily have 300,000 officers.

The next item is the WAC's. On July 1 there will be 19,000 Wacs in the Army, and all of them are volunteers. None of them were drafted. They are not subject to draft.

The next item is the Philippine Scouts. Congress, as we know, has provided for the enlistment of 50,000 Philippine Scouts. Congress is going to pay all the expenses of these scouts. They are not given the rights of the GI bill as are our volunteers, our soldiers, our enlisted men, our inductees, our draftees, but we do pay the bill, and pay it on a peso-for-dollar basis. That is, we pay to a Philippine Scout the same number of pesos we pay dollars to an American soldier.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. So that it will be on the record, I merely wish to bring out the fact that the 50,000 Philippine Scouts do not increase the size of the Army, but furnish the replacements for citizens of the United States who return home. There is merely an exchange of men. Those who live in the Philippines will take the places of our soldiers who have gone there and want to return home.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. However, they are included in the total of 1,550,000. The Philippine Scouts on July 1 will number 6,000.

Then we come to the draftees. The drafted men in the service with less than 6 months' service number 110,000; with less than 12 months but more than 6 months, 190,000; with less than 18 months but more than 12 months, 275,000; which makes a total of 575,000 men.

I call attention to the fact that during the time the younger men were taken into the service, we inducted through the Selective Service 1,075,415 men. As the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, many of those men have volunteered, so we have to deduct their number from the number of drafted men, and include them with the volunteers. Out of the 1,075,415 men we

drafted only 575,000. I want to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the fact that on July 1, 1946, there will not be 1 man in the service with 2 years of service. There will be very few men in the service, that is, who do not want to remain in the service. There will be very few men in the service with less than 2 years and more than 18 months of service. Most of the drafted men, to the total of 575,000, will have had 18 months of service or less.

We come now to the volunteers. The number of 3-year volunteers is 420,015. The number of 2-year volunteers is 10,989. The number of 18-month volunteers is 211,666. The number of 1-year volunteers is 164,275, making a total of 806,945. The normal attrition, which I have only estimated, is 6,945, which leaves a total of 800,000.

Of course, if the estimate of volunteers of 800,000 is too high, the estimated number of the drafted men would have to be adjusted accordingly and adjusted upward. If the estimated number of volunteers of 800,000 is too low, the figure for drafted men would have to be reduced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the Senator a question. I understood the Senator from Colorado to say that the total figure for volunteers, namely, 800,000, might be slightly larger than the actual number who would volunteer or slightly smaller, as of July 1, 1946. Is not the figure of 806,945 a very accurate figure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; that is a very accurate figure. It is a little over 1 month for which the estimate is made; that is, 10 days in May and 30 days in June, or a total of 40 days. For that period the number is estimated. The remainder of the figures come from actual War Department figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the whole of the first column under July 1, 1946, contains really very accurate figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. The figures under July 1, 1946, must be very accurate, because they are the War Department's own figures, and I have great confidence that the figures are accurate.

I now call the attention of Senators to the next column. Of course, some of these figures must be based on estimates. The required strength, as of July 1, 1947, is 1,070,000. The number of officers which the Air Force and the Army expect to have is 133,794. With respect to WAC's, they want, and no doubt can get, 10 times the number they have set forth in the table, but they have placed the limit as of now at 5,000.

With respect to Philippine Scouts, it is estimated 50,000 will be obtained.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HART. I understand that the recruiting of the Philippine Scouts has been extremely slow, although the law covering them has been in effect for some time.

Will the Senator elaborate upon his assurance from the War Department that the total number will be 50,000 a year hence?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I said, that is only an estimate. I have made every effort to ascertain whether that estimate was too high or too low. I conferred with the new President of the Philippines, Roxas, when he was here in respect to the matter. I have talked with the High Commissioner, Paul McNutt, and I have talked with officers in our own War Department with regard to that number. All of them think that the total number of 50,000 will be recruited.

The reason the recruiting of the Philippine Scouts has proceeded so slowly is due to the fact that even though the Congress passed a bill which authorized the War Department to recruit Philippine Scouts on a peso-per-dollar, or on a dollar-per-peso basis, the War Department did not recruit them on that basis. The War Department tried to recruit them on the old 21-peso-a-month basis. The War Department tried to save a few dollars for our badly damaged Treasury. It simply resulted in no recruits. Congress has clarified its own statute to some extent. The Appropriations Committee has had conversations with the War Department on this point, and the War Department is now determined to proceed and recruit the Philippine Scouts on the peso-dollar basis. I presume that when we increase the pay of our own soldiers, as I hope we will in a few minutes from now, we will also raise the pay of the Philippine Scouts, because they are paid on the peso-dollar basis in proportion as our soldiers are paid. So I have great confidence that the 50,000 Philippine Scouts will be recruited, and that confidence is based on the confidence displayed to me by persons who ought to know.

The next item is the drafted men with less than 18 months of service on July 1, 1947, the number being 86,384. That is a very small number indeed. Again, that number will have to be adjusted according to the number of those who volunteer. If the number of those who volunteer is greater than I have estimated, the number of drafted men will decrease. If the volunteers do not measure up to my estimate, then the item there with respect to drafted men will have to be increased.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HART. The Senator has already answered the question I was about to ask. I was about to remind the Senator from Colorado what the Senator from South Dakota said concerning the 80 percent figure he gave a few minutes ago. In other words, that of the men drafted to date, approximately 250,000, or 80 percent had volunteered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; the Senator from South Dakota did not say that. The Senator from South Dakota said that 80 percent of the men who volunteered had been drafted. He did not say that 80 percent of the men who were drafted had volunteered. There is a great difference in that respect.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make the matter clear?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. GURNEY. In the 8 months just past, on June 1, 197,340 men had enlisted for 18 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did they volunteer?

Mr. GURNEY. It is estimated conservatively that 80 percent of the 197,000 came into the Army in the first place through selective service. After they were in they decided that they only wanted to serve 18 months, rather than to take their chance on serving 12 months or 24 months or 30 months. So they exercised the option we gave them in the law passed last fall whereby they could enlist for a specified length of time, 18 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but, of course, the Senator's conclusions are his own as to why they did it or why they did not do it. The point I make is that not 80 percent of men who are inducted into selective service are volunteers but 80 percent of those who volunteered came in through selective service, which is a vastly different thing.

The total figure, as of July 1, 1947, is 1,155,327. Then I subtract the normal attrition of 85,000. I have no way of knowing whether that is a sufficient number for attrition. I presume it is. It may be far too small. If it is too small and the number of men who volunteer is smaller than the number estimated, of course, the number of men who would be drafted would be greater. But that is the virtue of section 2 of the pending bill. That adjustment can be made without any difficulty whatsoever. If the number of volunteers falls, more men can be inducted through the draft. If the number of volunteers justifies the optimistic estimate of the Senator from Colorado and other Senators who are also optimistic upon that point, then the number of men drafted declines. It seems to me that it is a very well-worked-out balance between the two ideas, those of the volunteer optimists and the volunteer pessimists. The volunteer pessimists say we cannot get the men. The optimists say we can. How are we going to settle that question? It seems to me that the Military Affairs Committee worked that settlement out as well as it could be worked out by adopting the provisions of section 2 of the Gurney bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. That section insures the armed forces the number of men they must have in order to perform their tasks and to meet their commitments, and yet at the same time it provides for obtaining every possible man by the voluntary enlistment method. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, that is true. It has been said to me that under that kind of provision the War Department is not going to try to obtain volunteers, because they will say "We can get them either way. We do not have to

have volunteers." I heard from General Eisenhower's own lips that he wanted a volunteer army. I did not hear General MacArthur say it, but I was told that General MacArthur said the same thing. I heard all the other generals say, as the Senator from Alabama has heard them say, that they wanted a volunteer Army. So I simply cannot feel that the Army is not going to try to secure an army of volunteers. I think the Army is going to have as few drafted men as it possibly can.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal in this debate, and read a great deal in the press, about the so-called disintegration of the Army. Of course, if an army is reduced from 8,000,000 down to 1,500,000, there must be some disintegration. That cannot be avoided. But I do not think there is any one, either in the Congress or anywhere else—aside from some of the folks in the Pentagon building—who would say that we must have an Army even approximating 8,000,000 men. So there has been a disintegration of the Army, if that is the right name for it.

However, in connection with that fact, I am reminded that 8 months ago the members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and members of the subcommittee on military matters of the Appropriations Committee were invited to listen to a chart talk by General Arnold. Many Senators will recall the talk which General Arnold gave us as to the part the Air Forces were going to play in the national defense, the bases which we would require, the airports which we would need, and everything else, complete down to the last man. He told us how many men he would need. He had it all figured out. The blueprints were complete, and they met with my hearty approval, because I am very enthusiastic about the Air Force defense of this country. I believe that that is the modern defense. I will not say that it is the only defense, but it is the most important defense the country can have. So I was highly pleased with General Arnold's presentation of the Air Force plan.

But what has become of that plan? We anticipated that the Army would come to the Congress with a plan, but it has not done so. The Navy worked out its plans at about the same time. It told us the number of ships it would need, the total number of men it would require, and presented a plan to the Congress. It was a good plan. It was approved in part, at least. I understand that the House Appropriations Committee has reduced the appropriations of the Navy to some extent; but the Navy made its plan for the defense of the Nation and brought it to Congress. Evidently it is working toward the completion of that plan. But for some reason or other the Army has not come to us with a plan for the defense of the country, or for the size of the Army.

As I recall, the Air Forces stated that they would need 400,000 men. I know, as every other Senator must know, that the Army would not have a particle of difficulty in getting all the men it could use in the Air Forces. All it would have to do would be to tell the truth about the

Air Forces, and how valuable it is for young men to learn aeronautical mechanics, including the flying of ships. It would get twice as many volunteers as it could use, because that sort of thing appeals to the young men of America. So I know that if the Air Forces tried to get volunteers to fill their needs they would have no difficulty whatever in doing so.

The Navy has had no difficulty in filling all its needs. The Navy has told the Selective Service that after June 1—a few days ago—it will not require any more drafted men. It can get along entirely with volunteers. The Navy is an attractive service to young men. A man has an opportunity, if he goes into the Navy, to learn almost any trade that will prove useful to him. His pay is advanced as he goes along. So the Navy is able to get along without drafting any men. I am sure that the Air Forces could get along without drafting any men.

That leaves only the Ground Forces of the Army. I refuse to believe that all the talk about disintegration is as serious as might be supposed. I have too much confidence in General Eisenhower, General Devers, General Spaatz, and the other military leaders to believe that they would sit around and let the Army completely disintegrate.

Of course, we are not ready for war at the moment. The more experienced men have dropped out and returned to civilian work. The reason why we are anxious to have the Congress adopt the pay increase is so that able men will find it advantageous to make military service a career. We must have career men. The situation is not like that which obtained in the days of George Washington, when all a man had to do to be ready for war was to put a musket over his shoulder. Today soldiers must be technicians. They must be men experienced in the use of fighting machinery and apparatus.

The other day a few Senators had the privilege of seeing the jet-propelled plane—an uncanny thing. It reminded me, as it darted about in the air, of a swallow darting here and there and going in any direction it wanted to go almost instantaneously. I examined one of those ships. I found that it had mounted in its nose eight .50-caliber machine guns, each of which would shoot 250 times. When we see a speedy instrument of war such as that, which can fly faster than sound, we are greatly impressed. We hear the sound over here when the ship is over there. With a weapon such as that, with its armament so arranged that all the pilot has to do is to point his ship toward the enemy and step on a button to create devastation, we can understand something more about the need of the Army for trained men in the future.

That is why I am so hopeful, Mr. President, that the pay schedule amendment which we intend to offer will be adopted by the Senate. As I say, we shall not be taking any undue chance. If it does not work, if it does not bring in volunteers—and I am sure it will bring them in—then, of course, we shall have to resort to the draft.

Mr. President, that completes my statement on the bill. I ask that the table to which I have been referring be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Military manpower balance sheet for Army*  
JULY 1, 1946—REQUIRED STRENGTH 1,550,000

<b>Assets:</b>	
Officers.....	150,000
Wacs.....	19,000
Philippine Scouts.....	6,000
<hr/>	
<b>Drafted men:</b>	
Less than 6 months service.....	110,000
Less than 12 months but more than 6 months.....	190,000
Less than 18 months but more than 12 months.....	275,000
Total, drafted.....	575,000
<hr/>	
<b>Volunteers:</b>	
3 years.....	420,015
2 years.....	10,989
18 months.....	211,666
1 year.....	164,275
Total.....	806,945
Less normal attrition.....	6,945
Total, volunteers.....	800,000
Grand total.....	1,550,000

JULY 1, 1947—REQUIRED STRENGTH 1,070,000

<b>Assets:</b>	
Officers.....	133,794
Wacs.....	15,000
Philippine Scouts.....	50,000
Drafted men with less than 18 months service.....	86,384
Volunteers.....	1,106,694
Less 1-year and 18-month enlistments which expire.....	226,545
Total volunteers still in service.....	880,149
Total.....	1,155,327
Less normal attrition.....	85,327
Grand total.....	1,070,000

<sup>1</sup> Letter from War Department.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 128, 129, 260, Senate hearings.

<sup>3</sup> Approximately one-half of those drafted between Jan. 1 and June 30, 1946.

<sup>4</sup> Actual enlistments plus War Department estimates which are extremely pessimistic and doubtless 50 percent too low.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about a matter which is now pending before the Security Council of the United Nations. It is a question to which I addressed myself some time ago when it was earlier before the Security Council, and when there was fear that the Security Council might not assume jurisdiction of the subject. I refer to the government of Franco in Spain. I expressed in the Senate the earnest hope—and I thought I expressed the hope of democratic-minded people all over the world—that the United Nations would take jurisdiction over the Franco government and would determine, by a fair inquiry, whether or not the government of Franco Spain constituted a threat to the peace of the world. Perhaps it was never more pertinent for us to talk about peace than when we are considering raising an army which may be needed to wage war or to protect the security of the Nation.

As we all know, the Security Council did take jurisdiction over the question whether or not the government of Franco in Spain constituted a threat to the peace of the world. After reading the press reports day by day, I do not believe it can be claimed that the principal credit for that action of the Security Council should go to the United States and Great Britain. I am rather of the opinion that the principal credit for the initiation of that inquiry will be awarded by historians to other nations of the world—for example, Poland, France, Brazil, and other nations.

A subcommittee of the Security Council, consisting of five members, was appointed to conduct this investigation and make this inquiry. The subcommittee has made its report. It has advised the Security Council—so we are informed by the press—that in its opinion the government of Franco in Spain is a potential threat to world peace, and it has recommended that action be taken, if I read the dispatches aright, leading to some kind of break between the members of the United Nations and the government of Franco Spain. But, Mr. President, the subcommittee added a recommendation of a procedural character which I lament most exceedingly. That was the recommendation, not that the Security Council should act, but that the whole matter should be referred to the General Assembly when it shall meet in September.

Mr. President, the United Nations, from the day of its inception, has been on trial before world opinion. What is of essential importance is that the United Nations establish character in the opinion of mankind. In my opinion, if it had neglected to take jurisdiction over the Franco question and government, the United Nations would have lost public confidence throughout the world to a dangerous degree, which I believe would have jeopardized the future usefulness of that organization, upon which we so much pin our hopes for world peace. But, exhibiting a courage which is highly commendable, and following a course which has inspired new confidence in its essential character, the subcommittee which was appointed fearlessly made its inquiry about the character of the Franco government as a threat to the peace of the world.

As I have stated, the subcommittee has reported back to the Security Council and given to the Council and to the world its findings of fact, to the effect that the government of Franco is a potential threat to the peace of mankind.

Mr. President, there was nothing surprising to most of us in the fact that such should be the finding of the subcommittee if it made an honest inquiry. According to the public press, the American delegation and the British delegation to the Security Council discouraged an inquiry about the character of the Franco government in Spain, notwithstanding the fact that the United States State Department had issued a white paper on the subject. I read on the floor of the Senate many excerpts from that State Department

white paper which told of the criminality of that government in its aid to the Axis during the war, and not only told the sad story of how the government of Franco Spain had been in league with Hitler and Mussolini, but told how German submarines had been given refuge and sanctuary in Spanish waters and had been fitted out by Spanish aid to go out into the Atlantic and send to a watery grave the boys from the United Nations who were fighting a war for democracy in the world.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, we are not surprised that this subcommittee has made such a finding and recommendation to the Security Council. But now that the matter is before the Security Council, by the report of its own duly appointed subcommittee, and now that that subcommittee has made its findings of fact that the Franco government was allied with Hitler and Mussolini during the war, that it did give aid to Hitler and Mussolini in the prosecution of the war, and that it did give sanctuary to German submarines and aided them in the vicious tasks they were carrying out on the seas, and, furthermore, now that it has been established that the Franco government gave immeasurable economic aid and afforded a base for spy activities, and so forth, for the Axis during the war, why is the matter now to be referred to the General Assembly when it meets in September of this year? We know that the executive arm of the United Nations is the Security Council, and it is charged primarily with keeping world peace. Mr. President, if the Security Council refers this matter to the General Assembly, it will indicate either that it has no confidence in its own subcommittee or that it is deliberately continuing to temporize with a moral challenge to the integrity of the United Nations organization as an instrument for keeping world peace and furthering democracy in the world.

So, Mr. President, at this time, while the Senate is debating the proposal to extend the Selective Service Act, we see that the answer to the question whether we shall have to call our boys into combat will depend to a large degree upon the situation in the world and whether threats to peace are stifled and strangled before they become an open menace to the safety and security of the world. So, when we are speaking of the peace and when we have so recently honored our beloved dead who gave their all for peace, I think it is time to give a moral challenge to the Security Council of the United Nations to be worthy of the high responsibility it bears to keep the peace of the world, and to strike down and weed out the potential menaces and threats to the peace on the part of those who have fought against us in the gaining of the victory and the keeping of the peace. I particularly urge that the Security Council act, and act now, in the way it deems best, upon the findings of fact made by its own subcommittee.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. AUSTIN obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. The occupants of the galleries are not supposed to cheer

or applaud or indulge in demonstrations of any kind. They are here by the grace of the Senate. I hope the Chair will instruct the police and the doorkeepers that if such demonstrations occur again the occupants of the galleries will be expelled from the galleries. This is not a town meeting or the back end of a domino joint, and I hope we shall not have a recurrence of the incident.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The doorkeepers will take notice and will maintain order in the galleries.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hawkes	Overton
Andrews	Hayden	Pepper
Austin	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Ball	Hill	Reed
Barkley	Hoyer	Rivercomb
Bridges	Huffman	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saitonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burch	Knowland	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stanfill
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Taft
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	Magnuson	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wheeler
Fulbright	Moore	Wherry
George	Morse	White
Gerry	Murdock	Wiley
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	
Hart	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Senate is nearly unanimously in favor of directing its legislation toward a peace that will prevail for a long time. Some time ago, by a vote of 85 to 5, it adopted the Connally amendment which recognized the necessity of a general international organization for peace. Last December, by a vote of 89 to 2, it ratified the treaty setting up such an organization. The essential idea of that organization is that specific methods should be provided for settling controversies among nations. But, in order to give it virility and make it effective, there is a provision in the covenant for the use of all kinds of peace forces which may be necessary, according to the situation, condition, or threatened aggression. A direct obligation was subscribed to by a vote of 89 to 2 to provide armed forces to be used by such organization to prevent war, and to attain that great objective for which we all strive, namely, that of preventing our young men, the brothers of those who are yet overseas, from being compelled to engage in a war more bloody than any which the world has ever seen.

We did not commit ourselves as a bluff. We were not fooling or trying to fool the world about our attitude. We were expressing our determination at a time when we had the stamina to employ all the peace forces which might be necessary in order to prevent war. Such

forces need not be enormous. At least our policy, which has been the historic policy of a republican form of government, is to have as relatively small a force of ground troops, air troops, and navy, as we can safely maintain. Behind them we want a militia consisting of all men in the country between certain age limits who are well trained, and ready to join the colors not after a protracted period of training, but then and there whenever danger may arise.

In connection with this effort which we are given an opportunity to exert, I assert that there is no piece of proposed legislation so effective and so necessary as the bill which is before the Senate at this time. In the past 12 months we have seen our armed forces almost completely dissipated. As this debate has proceeded we have learned of numbers which sound like a substantial army. But, in all probability, we do not have a single division which is as competent as it was 12 months ago, and sufficiently equipped to perform the maximum of service, or able to appear to perform such service in gaining the objective of the prevention of war.

Mr. President, what do we have on this continent to contribute to the United Nations in the event we are called upon immediately to furnish an effective force? The wings of our air force are not effective because of the lack of certain specialists among the ground troops who are essential in order to maintain the planes and keep them in flying condition. We have magnificently trained pilots, and plenty of them, but because of the peculiar method which we followed after VJ-day in returning our men to their homes we stripped what was really our front-line defense of the men who are necessary in order to make effective our air forces.

As we undertake to negotiate at New York in the meetings of the United Nations, we expose to the people who represent the great treaty powers, as well as the smaller ones, a nation which has stripped itself of the only sanction which is effective in a great controversial negotiation among nations. We have reduced ourselves to a condition of weakness which renders much less effective the great men whom we send to those meetings to participate in the negotiations.

What I have said about the United Nations is also true with reference to our efforts in connection with definitive negotiations concerning peace treaties. We are so weak that we excite in the minds of other great nations the question whether we are going to carry out our given word. We raise doubt as to whether we are going to carry out that number one promise which we made at Potsdam, namely, to occupy the enemy territory—not merely to furnish a vacation or a picnic to our troops who are there at the present time, but to occupy effectively that area and to cooperate with our allies who were responsible with us for the victory, in a manner and for such length of time as may be necessary to completely pacify the enemy and reduce him to a condition where he cannot rise up against and start another war in which the brothers of American boys

who are now overseas, or their children, will have to offer their lives.

Mr. President, is this not a number one obligation? Do we repudiate it now or do we intend to carry it out with the same vigor and stamina which we exercised when we adopted the United Nations covenant?

In that covenant there is a recognition of the propriety of the nations who actually fought the war and won the battle entering into arrangements such as those made at Potsdam, and the Senate of the United States has bound itself to that obligation. Are we going to fail? No, Mr. President, I do not believe we are going to fail. But certainly we are doing something that is very dangerous, that is, we are giving the impression that we are going to fail, and we are exciting in the minds of certain countries fear, and causing them to take an attitude of unilateral security, to surround themselves with buffer states, so that if that which appears to be should turn out to be so, they will have protected their security.

Mr. President, the following purports to be a sentence taken from the May Day address of Generalissimo Stalin:

It is necessary to be constantly vigilant to protect, as the apple of one's eye, the armed forces and defensive power of our country.

I take that from the New York Times of May 5, 1946.

In the negotiations for the definitive peace treaties I perceive among the difficulties encountered a fear that the United States of America is going to repeat the performances in which it has engaged heretofore, and turn its back upon the rest of the world, turn its sight inward, increase its nationalism, decrease its interest in international affairs, and fail to provide the peace forces which are necessary for security if we are going to trust to a general international organization for security, instead of to the old method of extreme nationalism and power politics.

In other words, the extension of the Selective Service and Training Act meets two very important objectives. First, and above all, it meets the objective of assuring all the world that the United States is going to carry out its commitments fully, and that the United States can be depended upon. Second, it meets the objective of strengthening the United Nations and contributing to it as a great leader, probably the greatest leader in all the world, by assuring that organization that the United States of America is ready and will continue to be ready to contribute all the peace forces necessary to supplant and remove war in the determination of controversies among nations, and to remove the necessity for unilateral action by any single country.

In the meantime, as a subsidiary characteristic of this extension, we actually do protect our own homeland. During the period, which may be long, in which the United Nations is developing and becoming a truly effective organization for security and peace, we will, by the extension of the Draft Act, enable our Government and our people to maintain the kind of military forces and the number and strength thereof necessary to garri-

son protective bases in the islands along our coasts, to guard strategic spots such as the Panama Canal and Alaska, and to safeguard our security here at home.

Not all men who would be drafted or who would volunteer into the armed services would be carrying guns. Many thousands of them would perform other services of a civilian character in order to maintain the efficiency of the armed services, and not the least of these is the duty of training. If we carry out the policy, which as a great leader in the world we have declared, we will have a well-trained militia, and we will have to afford the necessary men for its training, not for 6 months, but for years, thus affording the appearance of military strength, and also the actual effectiveness that would meet any aggression, from whatever source it might come.

Therefore, Mr. President, the cause is very great. In my opinion, if we withdrew from the Government of the United States this support, we might just as well quit in our endeavors to establish an effective and strong United Nations, and we might as well make up our minds to accept what other great treaty powers who maintain their vigor will let us have in the negotiations for definitive peace treaties.

If it be a postulate that the United States by these great majorities has shown that it intends to do whatever is necessary in order to attain the peace which shall prevail, we only have to consider questions relating to details, for all of us would be in favor of an extension of the National Service Act.

The question then arises, based on the experience of 6 years, what is the fact with respect to depending upon the volunteer system only in order to maintain our military status? There can be no controversy over that. One look at the graph, the descending scale of volunteers ever since we passed an act to stimulate the volunteer method, is sufficient to close the argument on the proposition that we simply cannot depend on the volunteer system alone. We tried it. We wrote it into the Selective Training and Service Act. I think few are conscious now that the Selective Training and Service Act in its original form, and as it exists today, contains this reference to the training method. I read only a part of section 3:

The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the land and naval forces of the United States for training and service, in the manner provided in this act, such number of men as in his judgment is required for such forces in the national interest: *Provided*, That within the limits of the quota determined under section 4 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, regardless of race or color, between the ages of 18 and 36, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me finish the reading, and then I shall yield.

We have to consider that also in connection with section 4 (a), which in part provides:

The selection of men for training and service under section 3—

From which I have just read—

(other than those who are voluntarily inducted pursuant to this act) shall be made in an impartial manner.

Then I read from subsection (b), which relates to quotas:

Quotas of men to be inducted for training and service under this act shall be determined for each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof \* \* \*. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. \* \* \*. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

Thus, Mr. President, from the very beginning the volunteer system has been permitted, until it was closed by an order of the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief, and those who volunteered were taken into account in filling the quotas in the subdivisions in which they resided. So, in actual practice, from the very beginning we were counting volunteers and subtracting the sum of them from the total call for the area in which they lived.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad the Senator in the minutes following my first efforts to interrupt him, stated that the volunteer system was in effect until the President by regulation stopped it.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that occurred early in 1942. The Navy was compelled to take its men through the draft when they could get all the men they wanted through the volunteer system.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is perfectly true. Then subsequently a new chapter was written in the story of volunteers. On October 6, 1945, there was passed by the Congress an act to stimulate volunteer enlistment in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States. Remember that the Selective Training and Service Act dealt with the Army of the United States, and that the men taken under that act went into the Army of the United States. The act to which I have last referred relates to the Regular Army, the Regular Establishment, and provides inducements attractive to young men who might wish to make military life a career. That went into effect. It was effective, as can be seen by the enormous jump in enlistments shown by this graph which reveals that a total of 185,000 volunteered into the Regular Army as a direct and immediate result of that act.

But Mr. President, that did not answer the call. Even with that tremendous upsurge of interest we were short of men, and the call from Selective Service, in addition, was 50,000 other men. With all this enlistment and all this induction there was a deficit of 14,000 men. There were inducted only 36,000. Thir-

ty-six thousand from fifty thousand leaves fourteen thousand deficit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado rose.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator wish to have me yield to him at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish the Senator would yield to me at this point. As I recall, the 50,000 estimate was made by the President following VJ-day and was made before the 185,000 men volunteered. My recollection is that the President placed a limit on inductions through the draft of 50,000 following VJ-day. So it is hardly correct, it seems to me, to say that the 50,000 was in addition to the 185,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. It was, though.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. As I understand, the Selective Service was asked to furnish the Army 50,000 each month starting with November 1945. The call remained at 50,000 each month until April, when the call was raised to 125,000. The increased number was provided to take care of the shortages which had accrued in previous months. Then when the call was made for 125,000, there came in in April 1946 only 43,636.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further on that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from South Dakota, of course, is correct when he says that Selective Service called upon its draft boards for the number of men he mentioned. But I am talking about the President's limitation on Selective Service of 50,000 following VJ-day. The Senator from South Dakota says that Selective Service asked for 125,000 for the month of April.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; not Selective Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the Selective Service asked for 125,000 for the month of April. They did that expecting that the draft would expire May 15. As General Hershey and others connected with Selective Service testified, they expected that they could bring in 75,000 IV-F's, and 75,000 IV-F's plus the 50,000 they hoped to get through the ordinary methods of Selective Service made the total of 125,000. There was no particular shortage as of the month of April. Of course, they could probably have used 200,000 or 300,000 during the month of April, but nothing happened in the month of April that made a requirement above the requirements of other months. It was simply the fact that Selective Service might pass out of the picture on May 15, so they wanted to get all the men they could, and they figured that they might get as many as 75,000 as the result of a resurvey of men who had been deferred and classified as IV-F's.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is nearly correct, and the point of difference is a technical one, but I think it ought to be noted in the RECORD, and that is that it is not Selective Service that makes the call. It is the Commander in Chief through the Secretary of War. He makes the call

on Selective Service, and Selective Service inducts the men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; that, of course, is correct, except that I was talking about the call which the National Selective Service makes upon the various draft boards throughout the country.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that is the subsidiary call.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. That is what I was talking about.

Mr. AUSTIN. The record I have in my hand, and which I know to be authentic, shows that there was a deficit notwithstanding they opened up and reclassified IV-F's and expected to get an additional pool from that source. Whereas the call was for 125,000 men, all they were able to induct was 42,000, and they had a deficit of 83,000. The progressive decline in the volunteer enlistments into the Army is very significant and very marked. The deficit goes down the scale in months, as follows: November, 14,000; December, 29,000; January, 18,000; February, 20,000; March, 20,000; April, 83,000; and in the first 3 weeks in May the deficit was 30,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but I should like to state my thoughts in coherent order if possible.

Mr. LANGER. According to the figures given by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota there was a decline, for the month of May, of 10,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know to what the distinguished Senator from North Dakota refers. I am using figures which I have obtained within a day from the military department.

Mr. LANGER. I am using the figures given us earlier today by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. It was thought that volunteers would total 50,000 for the month of May; and that the call of Selective Service would be also 50,000, making a total of 100,000 men who were wanted. We have to estimate for the last week in May. We have actually gotten in the first 3 weeks of May, 32,000 volunteers. The number expected was 43,000 volunteers for the whole month of May. Then we have gotten through selective service 12,000. So, we will have a shortage of 45,000 in the month of May.

Mr. AUSTIN. The difference between the figures I gave and those which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has given is that I am dealing with the first 3 weeks in May and not with the estimated figures for the whole month.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator from Vermont will yield once more to me to suggest one more point, I shall not bother him any further.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One reason for the decline in the number of men drafted was the many deferments given by the draft boards to high-school

students and to other students in the year 1946. I am wholeheartedly in favor of that policy. I am glad the boards made those deferments. I think it was very wise, and I am in full accord with that policy. But it does explain why more men were not inducted into the Army in the various months in 1946. They were being deferred in rather wholesale lots by selective service.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the point is that the call was not filled. Even though the call was fixed at only 50,000, it was not filled. What is the inference? The inference is that men do not volunteer even though there was the pressure behind them of a Selective Service System, and even though there was the inducement of better conditions, a shorter period of liability, and the right to choose the branch of the service they desired to enter. Notwithstanding these things the volunteer plan was inadequate, and that is the whole point of this history. If we are to be guided by the lamp of experience we must be guided away from the phantom of relying wholly upon the volunteer system. This is not a new thought. Throughout the history of the selective-service experience we have been confronted with the identical claim which is made here today. It has persisted all the time. It is a species of wishful thinking.

I have in my hand the original minority report on the selective-service bill, dated August 5, 1940. Does not this have a familiar ring?

A 1-year voluntary enlistment will provide more men for such training than can now be cared for with existing military equipment.

Voluntary enlistment should be given a thorough trial before any Hitlerized method of peacetime conscription with its far-reaching implication of militarism and imperialism is adopted as a permanent policy in America. After a thorough and fair trial, if the voluntary enlistment plan falls in part or in whole, then before it is too late the minority will gladly support conscription, but not before.

That is a fair representation of the position which is taken today. I do not question the sincerity of those who take it. All I claim is that it has less probative force today than it had then, 6 years ago, because of our experience with it. In my judgment, as reasonable men we should be guided by experience. I am not against the idea of adequate inducements such as the distinguished Senator from Colorado wishes to have added to the pending legislation, in the form of money inducements. I rather favor the idea. As a matter of fact, the sooner our military department, in all its various services, is put upon a high level, paid properly, and made more efficient than it is today, the sooner we can feel that we are carrying out our pledge and that we are making good on the effort of all mankind to obtain a condition in which we shall not have to resort to war any more, and in which our forces will be peace forces, not designed to wage war, but designed to prevent or arrest war. I hope the day may come when we can have such forces so organized, and have reduction of armaments carried out so effectively that

there will not be a single mass destructive weapon in all the world, and when the United Nations will have control over such peace forces as are necessary to prevent aggression by force of one country upon another. For that purpose of peace, if mass destructive weapons are outlawed, a well-trained militia behind a small Army, a small Navy, and a small Air Force will be sufficient.

We look forward to that day; but in the meantime we must live. In the meantime we must so govern ourselves that we shall not expose the world to war by our own weakness and inefficiency. In other words, in the meantime we must maintain forces of such size and quality, and we must retain such military secrets, as will come very near to assuring us that our beloved United States of America will not be subject to aggression. If we can go further and attain the objective of protecting the Western Hemisphere in the meantime, I should be very glad to see that done. The world is in such confusion that it is not certain that we may not be confronted by aggression in various places. Then, if it should occur in the Western Hemisphere, we as a Congress would have failed in our duty to our people if we had not maintained up to date, and all the time, a well-trained militia and an effective armed force.

How bad this situation is from the nonprofessional point of view is eloquently reflected in an editorial in the New York Times of May 29. I read this, Mr. President, because it is very impressive:

#### RESULTS OF A GAMELE

When General Eisenhower made his vain plea to Congress in April for an extension of selective service he warned that if the act was not extended it would be a gamble with national security. How right he was on the first point—and the second automatically follows—is shown in a survey of selective-service boards made by this newspaper. The survey of 41 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska shows many States running as much as 90 percent behind quotas, enlistments sharply declining—even before the crippling of the act by the House and passage of only a stop-gap 45-day extension to July 1—and reduction of the pool of available qualified men to 36,000.

I digress to say that in his basic address the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] referred to that pool as approximately 70,000. I believe he said 72,000. In any event it was approximately 70,000. But, Mr. President, he was speaking of all the men above the age of 20 and below the age of 30. Our experience has shown that we cannot count more than 50 percent, because of the rejections, deferments, and all the other reasonable causes for not bringing such men into the armed services.

I resume the reading of the editorial:

With the House reported ready to vote down any extension of selective service at all after July 1—even the inadequate version now in force—it is a gloomy future that faces our military forces, charged with the duty of guaranteeing this Nation's security and carrying out our commitments of occupation and maintenance of bases. The most

optimistic estimate is that by July 1, 1947, our Army will be 110,000 men short of quota—

That should be January 1, Mr. President, 6 months earlier than this. I shall read it "January 1" because I have verified it and know that it is correct—

and by January 1, 1948, it will be 165,000 below minimum requirements.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has alluded to this phase of the danger confronting us.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that I may follow the Senator, I understand that what he is assuming is based upon the premise that there will be no inductees at all, and that we shall rely exclusively upon the volunteer system.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

I resume the reading of the editorial:

These estimates are based on the possibility of 30,000 enlistments a month, which must be rightly viewed—as they were by one Army spokesman—as extremely optimistic. Even during the first 2 weeks of May, while the original Selective Service Act still was in force, enlistments declined markedly. Since May 15 this trend has been accelerated. "Volunteers dwindling" was one report; "fall off sharply to nothing," said another; "sharp drop in May when revised law was passed," reported Selective Service headquarters in Louisiana. Those are typical of all but four States.

This is "off the board," Mr. President. This is the testimony of someone outside the military department, outside the political department of Government—outside the Government entirely.

The facts that this survey discloses cannot be dismissed as statistical mumbo-jumbo. The survey was neither inspired, dictated or controlled by anyone connected with the Army; the information was gathered largely from civilian board officials, men who have devoted themselves to an unpleasant, irksome task for many years because they saw it was something that had to be done. They have no reason to give misleading information just to save a few jobs for generals. That is one of the grossly unfair charges that was made against the Army itself when it attempted to point out the necessity for a continuance of selective service if it was to have the men it needed to carry out the missions assigned it by the very Congress that now refuses it the means.

It is a real crisis that faces the Army—one that cannot be met, our survey indicates, by wishful congressional thinking on enlistments. It is a crisis, too, where the responsibility is single and conclusive. It lies squarely on Congress. It seems evident that failure of Congress to act before July 1, or for it to act adversely, will not even be a gamble with the future; it will be a clear repudiation of responsibility. Is that an issue on which Congress wishes to go to the American people in November?

Mr. President, I have faith in Congress. I do not believe that Congress is going to the people with that issue.

We have had to consider the matter of extension of the draft under very adverse circumstances, for we were crowded for time and were overwhelmed with other great problems relating to attainment of the objective of peace. The extension of the draft act has been postponed and put off and caught in a jam, and hasty legislation has been enacted. So now we are very near the dead line

because, after we act, our conduct will have to be reviewed and surveyed by the other branch of Congress, and then, perhaps, there will be a conference, and in it the views of the conferees may differ so strongly that again we shall be in grave danger of facing a dead line and being compelled to agree upon something less effective than what we could have if we could act deliberately and if we were not overwhelmed by circumstances which have been adverse to a thorough consideration of this subject by us.

The immediate matter before the Senate relates to the most important difference between the House of Representatives and the Senate. We are now considering the amendment relating to the age brackets. It is the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. I shall read it at this point, beginning with the text of the amendment. This is the way the bill will read if we adopt the amendment:

SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 18 and 45 at the time fixed for his registration, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

Some have asked, "Why is it necessary to adopt that language?" The answer is that by virtue of the hasty legislation which we enacted as a stopgap, today the law fixes the age group as between 20 and 30 years, and in that group there are not a sufficient number of men who can qualify for service to come anywhere near meeting the necessities of the minimum requirements.

So, Mr. President, I think there are many and grave reasons for adopting this amendment and the other perfecting amendments which I understand will be offered, and then for passing the bill without change with respect to the age group as specified in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont if he cares to give me an answer to a question which has been put to me many times. People have asked me, "With the United Nations organization, why do we need this large Army? Is it not an evidence of a lack of confidence in the United Nations organization?" My reply has been that it is an evidence of our confidence in the United Nations organization and our intention to carry out our obligations under the United Nations organization. I should like to know what the Senator's view is regarding that matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree with the Senator from New Jersey. We contemplate

that before the United Nations organization can be set up and put into effective operation there will be a period during which we shall have to maintain a different type of service than that which we shall have to maintain thereafter, after the enemy has been pacified and has qualified to become a member of the United Nations, acting together with us, cooperating with us for peace. Think of the number of soldiers we shall not need then, the soldiers we shall remove from Europe—from Italy, from Austria, from Germany, and from other places. That will likewise be true in respect to Japan and China and other areas here and there in the Pacific basin. The change will be very great, after we have made the definitive peace treaties and have pacified the enemy and have established the United Nations organization upon an effective footing and, above all, if it could be done, after we have abolished and completely outlawed the use of mass-destructive weapons of all kinds.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I should like to ask one more question. The Senator from Vermont will agree, I assume, that by taking this action now to extend the Selective Service Act in this transition period from war to peace we are in no way establishing a policy of a draft Army, an Army by way of conscription.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, no, by no means. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Vermont whether the best answer to that is that we are still at war; we have not made a single peace treaty.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct and that is the best answer.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from one of the great organizations of America, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Their letter reads as follows:

NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN  
TEMPERANCE UNION,

Washington, D. C., May 14, 1946.

DEAR SENATOR: The Army has 736,000 volunteers as of April 30. All of these are in for at least a year; 80 percent of them for at least 18 months.

The Army says it needs 1,070,000 as of July 1, 1947. Subtract 736,590 from this figure and you get only 333,410 men required to reach that figure. 73,000 men enlisted during March under the new requirements stepped up from 59 to 70. 25,000 men per month would fill the required number.

Will you please object when the draft bill comes up today and vote against consideration on such a motion?

Very respectfully,

ELIZABETH A. SMART.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table which was inserted in the RECORD earlier today at the request of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], also be inserted at this point in the RECORD, following the letter I have just read, inasmuch as it verifies what is stated in the letter.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### How enlistments are running

[The table below shows the flow of volunteers into the Army by month and term of service. In addition there is shown the number of men inducted each month by Selective Service]

Term of service	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May 1-21 <sup>1</sup>	Total
1 year.....		8,460	58,776	41,929	21,256	11,291	8,443	6,567	3,921	160,643
18 months.....		5,156	29,210	28,457	31,084	36,305	29,203	27,346	10,579	197,340
2 years.....		313	1,307	1,206	2,374	1,579	1,314	1,024	585	9,702
3 years.....	12,093	50,843	95,547	59,392	58,740	43,906	34,539	28,930	17,665	401,655
Total.....	12,093	64,772	184,840	130,984	113,454	93,081	73,499	63,867	32,750	769,340
Inductees.....		37,133	34,107	21,527	34,494	30,780	48,597	43,636	12,000	251,395

<sup>1</sup> Note that this is for 3-week period.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in recent weeks the American people have been treated to many fine phrases and high-sounding words concerning America's future role in international affairs.

On May 12, President Truman stated:

I doubt whether there is in this troubled world today, when nations are divided by jealousy and suspicion, a single problem that could not be solved if approached in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. \* \* \* Ignorance and its handmaidens, prejudice, intolerance, suspicion of our fellowmen, breed dictators. And they breed wars.

On May 20, Secretary Byrnes reported to the American people concerning America's objective in the postwar world. Mr. Byrnes asserted that—

Our problems are serious, but I am not discouraged. Our offensive to secure peace has only begun. We are determined to work for political and economic peace in Europe, in the Near East, and in the rest of the world. We shall work for it in the peace conferences and in the councils of the United Nations. The objective of our offensive is not territory or reparations for the United States. The objective is peace—not a peace founded upon vengeance or greed, but a just peace, the only peace that can endure.

On May 21 the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan wholeheartedly supported these declarations of policy, and added his own interpretation by saying:

It is a policy which now substitutes justice for vengeance in these formulas of peace, which now insists upon ethnic recognitions that no longer traffic in the lives and destinies of helpless peoples, and which spurns expansionism as a plague upon tomorrow's peace and security. It is a policy which invites all of our partners in the war—instead of a closed corporation of big powers—to have a proper voice in the making of the treaties and the writing of the peace which result from the common victories which we all helped win. It is a policy which wants a people's peace.

But, Mr. President, the most amazing part of this sudden outbreak of noble declarations of policy and purpose is found in the following words of the senior Senator from Michigan. It is simply astounding to find him saying in his report to the Senate that—

The Council was a complete success in developing, at last, and in disclosing a positive, constructive, peace-seeking, bipartisan foreign policy for the United States. It is based at last upon the moralities of the Atlantic and the San Francisco Charters. Yet it is based equally upon the practical necessities required for Europe's rehabilitation.

Where did this "positive, constructive, peace-seeking, bipartisan foreign policy for the United States" come from, Mr.

President? Certainly it did not come from any understanding on the part of the American people of the terrible tragedies which have been committed in their name. The American people do not yet even begin to comprehend the terrible consequences of the criminal blunders of American statesmanship during the past two decades. As a matter of fact, they have had no way of knowing the truth.

On Monday, February 4, the Progressive carried a story by Oswald Garrison Villard titled "The Shame of the American Press," one paragraph of which explains very simply the reason why this new bipartisan foreign policy could not possibly have originated with the American people. Mr. Villard begins his article by saying:

The record of the American press during World War II and in the half year which has followed the end of hostilities is replete with sordid distortions of the truth. It is a record of shameful suppression, of too easy acquiescence in censorship, of apologizing and covering up for the mistakes of the military, of fanning hatreds against whole peoples even when the war was over, and of miserable incompetence and inadequacy in reporting the occupation of conquered countries and the struggle for freedom in colonial areas.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that in the February issue of the Review of World Affairs published in London, there is a startling parallel drawn between the suppression and distortion of the news in the United States and in England. According to this Review:

When one compares the real situation in Britain and abroad with the average political speech, one is, indeed, almost staggered. The gap between reality and declamation is almost incredibly wide. \* \* \*

Power now lies in the control of publicity, the ownership of newspapers, periodicals, radio stations, film-making concerns, and the movies. Candidates for statesmanship have failed to grasp this. They have left these professions to others. Consequently they find themselves powerless. Power lies with those who control the press, the movies, and the radio. They are the ones who rule. Until the best elements in the State penetrate and gain predominant influence in the various branches of publicity business, Britain will not be well-ruled. So long as power lies in publicity, a speech in Parliament may be heard by 40 or 50 Members of the House of Commons, perhaps 5,000 people will read it in Hansard. A brief and often garbled version may appear in the press at the discretion of a subeditor.

A war correspondent's story from Germany may be read by 10,000,000 people. The next morning what he says may be untrue, mischievous, or rubbishy, but it makes no difference. If it is well headlined, and cleverly presented, millions will accept it as a fact.

Mr. President, certainly this new bipartisan foreign policy which has suddenly emerged in our midst is not derived from the United States Senate. For many years now, Congress has been abused, evaded, ignored, and bludgeoned with the propaganda weapons manufactured by the bureaucracies and executive agencies of this administration until it is almost completely ignorant of the secret commitments, of the political betrayals, and of the basic policies of the very Government of which it is a part. And I challenge any Member of this Senate body to assert that he is sufficiently well informed of the commitments this Government has made and of the crucial issues that are at stake to warrant his blind acceptance of this alleged new bipartisan foreign policy that will bind all future parties and administrations in this Government.

Certainly, Mr. President, this new bipartisan foreign policy, well-intentioned and honorable as it may confess to be, could not possibly have derived from, and does not bear the least relation to the terrifying, criminal betrayals which are already in the record. The truth is that this administration, together with the leaders of the major victor powers, have betrayed every promise and every principle that has been made since the war began—principles upon which alone peace could endure.

Mr. President, do you remember those fine, high-sounding and noble principles for which allegedly we fought? Do you remember the Atlantic Charter? Never have humanity's hopes been raised so high or dashed so low. I am not referring now merely to the fact that Mr. Churchill repudiated the charter on his return to England. I am not referring to the fact that the late President tore those principles into little scraps of scribbled paper. I am not referring to the fact that Russia has never accepted the principles of the Atlantic Charter, all the propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding, since on September 24, 1941, when Ivan Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador to England, expressed Russia's adherence to the charter, he did so only after reading a long list of Russian reservations which constituted the Soviet Union's unique Atlantic and Pacific charter.

I am referring to the secret memorandum drawn up by Sumner Welles aboard the battleship *Augusta* on August 11, 1941, in which the late President made secret commitments to Great Britain, and laid the foundation for this United Nations Charter. Mr. Welles describes the late President's mind in the matter of international cooperation at that time by stating:

He himself would not be in favor of the creation of a new Assembly of the League of Nations, at least until after a period of time had transpired and during which an international police force composed of the United States and Great Britain had had an opportunity of functioning.

Mr. President, do you remember Pearl Harbor and the alleged treacherous attack? Secretary Stimson's diary now plainly reveals that this administration not only was waiting to be surprised, but, according to Secretary Stimson, on

November 25, 1941, Mr. Roosevelt and his war cabinet joined to discuss:

How we should maneuver them [the Japanese] into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves.

From that time on, this administration has repudiated and betrayed every principle and purpose the realization of which alone might have promised peace. How can men ever build peace on the foundations of the moral anarchy which the following sordid series of transactions has unleashed across the world?

Mr. President, do you remember the Moscow Conference which was heralded as a major triumph of American diplomacy, in which the Big Four had committed themselves to carry forward their alleged unity of purpose in the war on into the peace?

Do you remember Cairo and the Cairo Declaration which promised: "That in due course Korea shall be free and independent?"

In August 1945, the Sunday Observer of London revealed that long before Yalta and long after Cairo, President Roosevelt had concluded a secret agreement with Stalin on the Far East which not only betrayed Korea, but China as well. The late President agreed to the restoration of the Chinese Eastern Railway to the Soviet Union, the uniting of Outer and Inner Mongolia, the creation of a similar state in Manchuria, the annulment of the Portsmouth Treaty of 1905, and the giving of the Sakhalien and Kurile Isles to Russia.

No one yet knows when the present political and economic absurdities, which have cut Korea in two at the thirty-eighth parallel, and which constitute a partition of the Orient by turning over the heartland of Asia to Russia, was ever agreed upon.

I ask Senators to recall the Declaration of Iran, of December 1, 1943, in which the Big Three stated they were:

At one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran.

On the same day, the Big Three signed a solemn declaration at Tehran, in which they stated that—

Emerging from these cordial conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their consciences.

Remember Tehran, another of these alleged diplomatic triumphs? On February 5, 1946, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger revealed in a dispatch from Marseilles to the New York Times that the division of Europe into two conflicting spheres of influence had not only been discussed at Tehran, but had been formally solemnized in a secret agreement between the British and the Soviets early in the spring of 1944.

Mr. President, do you remember the Crimea Conference, at which the Washington Post said the late President suffered a relapse? Not a single agreement that was reached at Yalta has been kept. What were those agreements? The liberalizing of the Moscow-spawned gov-

ernments in Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Hungary was promised, yet the record shows not one of those promises has been kept.

Yalta will live long in the annals of infamy. The secret betrayals conjured up in an oriental fortress in the Crimea betrayed the very fundamentals of human decency and justice. Russia was given the green light to loot and rape Manchuria; China was cut in two and forced to grant to Russia all that she had fought Japan 10 years to regain. The Kurile Islands, which constitute a dagger pointed at the heart of the Asiatic coast and Alaska, was turned over to become a Russian fortress. The fraudulent veto formula agreed upon at Yalta made a mockery of all pretensions to democratic principles.

It was at Yalta that the late President agreed to the inhuman doctrine of forced repatriation of millions and the revival of human slavery.

At Potsdam the British and American representatives found the Russians already operating on the theory that slave labor had been sanctioned at Yalta. President Truman and former Prime Minister Churchill, recognizing a fait accompli when they saw one, and unwilling or unable to protest, agreed to Russia's use of slave labor as part of the infamous Big Three plans for the domination and enslavement of the human race as their rightful spoils of war.

Do we remember Potsdam? Here the representatives of the three great victor powers put their formal stamp of approval on alleged plans for peace which have already set in motion a human catastrophe and hunger calamity unknown to the civilized world. The Morgenthau plan for Germany is dragging what remains of western civilization down into the muck and mire of a new dark age of unadulterated devilry and degradation.

Of one thing we can be sure, Mr. President, when the American people come to the full realization of what these sordid betrayals of principle have done to America's prestige, security, and way of life, they will rise up in their wrath and repudiate all those who have brought this curse upon them.

The trouble is, Mr. President, that all these recent well-intentioned restatements of American policy, and this "new bipartisan foreign policy" bear no relation whatsoever to the terrifying realities of our international life. Today, 1 year after the war has ended, there is no peace. Instead, the most thoughtful men and women in America, including our false prophets of intervention and our former champions of the internationalism displayed at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco, stand aghast at the world calamity with which they are now confronted.

Dorothy Thompson now charges the framers of the United Nations organization, the framers of the postwar world, with having betrayed the peace. Writing in the Ladies Home Journal of February 1946, Miss Thompson cried out:

Gentleman, speak no more to the mothers about your peace and its "enforcement." Your peace seems almost more terrible to us than was the war. For beyond the war

we saw the rainbow of peace, but beyond your peace we see the lightning flashes heralding the thunders of war. Speak to us, gentlemen, of law; speak to us of liberty; speak to us of justice; speak to us of humanity; speak to us of truth.

Mr. Walter Lippmann now warns us that every statesman in Europe is thinking and acting in preparation for a new war between Britain and Russia which will involve all the other nations.

Justice Robert H. Jackson upon his return from the Nuremberg trials told the New York Herald Tribune Forum that there is "nothing that can honestly be called peace" in Europe. Justice Jackson went on to say:

Military engagements have ceased but the underlying conflicts which set Europe fighting are not solved.

The Washington Post of March 10, 1946, editorialized that:

We are faced today, however, with a condition, not a theory. The condition is not that Britain and Russia are preparing for war, but that Russia will not make peace. What our angel of peace is afraid of is, bluntly, Russian aggression. Only Russia has the might and the dynamism and the posture (her armies in Europe are all poised for battle) to break the peace.

Mr. John Foster Dulles now admits that even the Council of the United Nations is being used for personal gain at the expense of the peace by its participating members, and warns that as the new peace is taking shape, "its form is not a pleasing one, it resembles much the pattern of the past."

Mr. A. T. Steele, one of our ablest American correspondents, has cabled the following warning that:

We are losing the peace in southern Asia and losing it fast . . . sensitive observers are shocked at finding how persistent is the old-fashioned colonial mentality among some white liberators.

On May 22 Mr. Sumner Welles issued the following warning:

From Cairo to Tokyo, the eastern world is seething. All constituted authority, whether alien or national, has been gravely weakened during the past 7 years. The economic dislocations resulting from the war, culminating with the present famine, intensify the trend toward mass unrest, toward revolt, and toward eventual anarchy.

Certainly, Mr. President, this new bipartisan foreign policy bears no relation to the policies we have been pursuing across the world. Not only is there no peace, but the policies this Government has been pursuing are so contradictory, so self-defeating and so war breeding that, as the New York Herald Tribune of March 22 stated in its editorial:

The only possible conclusion is that the American State Department is afflicted with an acute form of schizophrenia.

The policies now being pursued by this Government are so contradictory that the whole world is afraid of the United States, even of its best intentions.

Again I say, Mr. President, that when the American people fully understand the tragic consequences of what our policies up to this moment have done to the world, they will repudiate all those who have brought such a catastrophe upon us. There has been so much said about

America's new obligations in international affairs, and such a terrible misrepresentation of what actually is happening to America in the process of meeting those obligations, that I cannot permit another moment to go by without challenging again the false doctrine and the false philosophy which is destroying America both from without and from within.

It would be frightening to discover, Mr. President, that this new bipartisan foreign policy, which was conjured out of the air of a Paris peace conference, is based on the same false doctrines and left in the hands of the same men who have brought us to this crisis. We have been told on every hand that the advent of the atomic bomb and the development of new scientific techniques of destruction have destroyed all the old concepts of security, military alliances, international relations, political and economic and social structures.

But I submit, Mr. President, that the simple basic human dignities and decencies, the respect for the liberties and rights of others, the desire to uphold the freedom and liberties which alone make life worth living, will be listed among the dreadful casualties of civilization if we permit this fearmongering to frighten us into a complete abandonment and betrayal of what remains of the American love of liberty and way of life.

Until our foreign policies, our dealings with other people, and our external relations with all the other nations of the world, are firmly rerooted and reestablished in traditional American concepts and practices, America as we have known it is doomed. I make no apology, Mr. President, for taking just a few moments to talk about America's future in relation to the present world tragedy we have brought upon ourselves.

In the first place, the American people cannot be made to realize too soon what the criminal betrayals of this war mean to America.

The commitments made at Moscow, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam have torn the world in two. The new world of internationalism, which was promised the American people as a reward for their sacrifice and suffering, is gone. That world required the genuine and voluntary cooperation of the major victors of this war in all economic, political, financial, and military problems of the world. That world required the voluntary and sovereign participation of a score or more nations which have now been swallowed up in the spheres of influence parceled out to each other by the Big Three. That world required the immediate supplanting of tyrannical and revolutionary regimes with the stable elements within each society which would have the power and could be depended upon to enter into negotiations and contracts as genuine representatives of the peoples and the nations involved.

That world required the reincorporation of the vanquished peoples into the economic, social, and political structure of the family of nations on a just and equitable basis.

Instead, Mr. President, the world has been torn in two. The system of sov-

eign independent nation states upon which all our international law of the past 400 years has been founded, has been destroyed. Russia stands today behind an iron curtain that stretches around half the world, including the Eurasian Continent. Russia has been left in control of the minority populations and the vast majority of the natural resources of both Europe and Asia.

What this means to America has now become perfectly obvious. America has been left with a condition which, even in peacetime, amounts to the underwriting and supporting of two bankrupt imperial possessions in western Europe and eastern Asia.

International law is gone, and in its place is a bitter struggle between ancient imperial rivals who are substituting bitter and vicious ideological penetration techniques and slogans in the place of justice.

The small independent sovereign states have been rescued from one tyranny and handed over as puppets to another.

International free trade, based on the free-enterprise system, is now confronted with a closed door, slave labor, state-controlled trade monopoly which is determined to continue to use the products both of agriculture and industry as a major political weapon.

In the Far East both China and Japan have become the breeding grounds of the new war. In Japan, Russia is bitterly antagonistic to our repudiation of communism both at home and abroad and to what amounts to our complete exclusion of Russian participation in the rehabilitation in Japan.

In China this administration, knowing full well the basic designs and intentions of Moscow and its Chinese Communist puppets, still is trying to force General Marshall to place the kiss of death on the Nationalist government in Chungking.

In Korea there is no neutral meeting ground for either Russia or America; there is only what amounts to a no-man's land between the two zones policed by military forces.

Nowhere in all the Far East is there a bridge remaining between Russia and the western democracies.

In Germany conditions have reached the point where, because of the criminal Morgenthau plan, Germany is now being carved up into what amounts to four nationalist military weapons, each directed against the other. From General McNarney down our Government officials now know that the insanities of the Potsdam Declaration, which incorporated the Morgenthau directives for the destruction of the German-speaking peoples, has become a vicious boomerang. What does all this mean to America? It means not only that we have been committed to underwrite the most savage policies of revenge, of destruction, of mass deportations, of slave labor, and deliberate mass starvation of millions of the helpless and the innocent; it also means that we have agreed to continue these present monstrosities at the expense of our own way of life.

I am quite convinced that those who have been clamoring loudest for the surrender of our traditional liberties, for the destruction of our economic, industrial,

and social system, and for the complete subordination of those principles and practices which have made America the greatest nation on earth, have themselves been ignorant of what they were seeking to destroy.

Let us recall for just a moment that America was derived from the remnants of four ancient empires—the British, the French, the Dutch, and the Russian. From its inception, America was dedicated as a sanctuary and refuge for the politically and spiritually oppressed who came to our shores that mankind might have a new birth of freedom under God. America has been something unique in human history. It was founded on the belief that the external relations of a nation ought always to reflect the internal economic, social, and political structure and concerns of the people.

It is this fact that gives a completely new significance to the words and wisdom of our founding fathers. Why did George Washington state in his Farewell Address—

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The Nation, which indulges toward another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate envenomed and bloody contests.

Why was it that Thomas Jefferson admonished the American people that we must ever follow the course of—

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political \* \* \* peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations \* \* \* entangling alliances with none \* \* \* the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies \* \* \* the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home, and safety abroad.

These warnings take on a wholly new significance in the light of our present international policy. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson believed that no democracy could exist which placed external conflict above progressive internal development. In other words, the earliest American statesmen sought to build a democratic society which, free from the constant curse and threats of external dangers, would have the time and the security to permit debate, deliberation, and experimentation with the development of a full and free economic, social, and political system. It was this vision in the minds of our early statesmen that gave America the chance to develop inwardly the highest standard of living and the maximum in human freedom of any nation on earth.

It was for this sole purpose that these men warned against entangling alliances, favoritism in our relations toward

other nations, and the involvement of America in the tragic struggle for empire which has destroyed every other nation that has attempted it.

Such a new bipartisan foreign policy, if continued, will permanently destroy this basic American concept and reimpose here at home the regimentation and bureaucratic controls which will strangle our social, economic, and political freedom from within.

As matters now stand we are well on the way toward that fate. We now have what amounts to two permanently bankrupt imperial possessions which can only survive as our economic, financial, political, and military wards.

Why does the President want permanent peacetime military conscription for the first time in our history? The reason is perfectly obvious. We can never maintain our so-called military commitments to supply armies of occupation in the conquered countries to man the far-flung outposts of new security bases we are demanding, police the world, and provide for our own security without destroying our traditional American way of life.

What about the permanent deficit economies which are now turning to us for support? In spite of all the world banks and world funds which were to stabilize currencies, and the economies of nations, and open up the channels of new trade, we are now in the process of accepting as a permanent American policy an international financial pump-priming scheme in which the Government goes into the business of loaning the American taxpayers' money for what is now admitted to be a purely political purpose.

What about our reciprocal trade agreements? On the basis of the present American policy of the destruction of 25 percent of the world's productive capacity of steel and basic machine tools and laboratory equipment which is represented in the plans for dismantling German and Japanese industry, and with Russia's closed door trade policy around half the world, the other nations left outside the Russian sphere, including England, not only will be competing bitterly for the products of American industry; but, if we are not permanently to finance their deficit economies, we must lower our own standards of living to permit them a larger part of the American market to compensate for the world market we have destroyed. Even then a rigid system of priorities must be imposed to guarantee the American people those goods with which to meet their own essential needs.

Mr. President, if any Senator has a friend in Mexico today all he has to do is to telegraph to him or speak to him on the telephone and he will find from his friend in Mexico that the newspapers of Mexico are filled with advertisements offering for sale automobiles of every kind and character. Russia is exporting them to Mexico for sale, and so is England. They have taken over the field that General Motors, Chrysler, Ford and some of our other automobile manufacturing concerns formerly occupied. One need only go downtown in the city of Washington to some of the stores where candies are for sale, such as Lifesavers, and one will

find on picking up a small package of Lifesavers the words printed on the package, "Made in Mexico," or "Made in the Argentine." That, Mr. President, is the result of the policy we have been pursuing.

Finally, what about food? On the basis of our present international policies we have already created the most terrifying hunger catastrophe in history. Nearly half the human race faces starvation. Millions have already starved and are continuing to starve. America can never meet the food commitments that have been made without reimposing and maintaining rationing in a stricter form by seizing food at its source here at home.

That is why LaGuardia is quoted in the newspapers as saying, "We are going to North Dakota and seize the wheat there," even though, Mr. President, the farmer in North Dakota may need the wheat for replanting in case of a drought, even though the farmer may need the wheat for seed so he and his family can exist. That is the result of the foreign policy of the United States. LaGuardia says, "We are going to seize the wheat in North Dakota."

If this is the kind of a new foreign policy which is to guide America's steps into the future, it is a repudiation of every principle and practice America has stood for throughout her history and it will lead us to our destruction.

If the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan really believes that he has discovered a new "bipartisan foreign policy" which will preserve America from such a fate—and I congratulate the Senator from Michigan if he has discovered it, because I believe he is sincere—which will serve to prevent the transformation of the United Nations organization into an Anglo-American alliance against Russia and which will prevent the outbreak of an atomic war, I wonder if he would not heartily endorse the following concurrent resolution as a necessary means of acquainting Congress and the country with the crucial issues now confronting us, the settlement of which are going to mean life or death to America and to civilization.

The concurrent resolution which I submit, Mr. President, is as follows:

Whereas the House vote on draft extension expresses an overwhelming opposition throughout the country in all parties to sending boys to police the world; and

Whereas a conscript army made up mainly of boys is admitted by General Eisenhower to be inferior to a volunteer army, for purposes of occupation of former enemy countries; and

Whereas commitments and obligations are being made by our Government for vast outlays of the taxpayers' money in bases throughout the world which will require garrisons of American youth into the indefinite future; and

Whereas the American people have throughout our history opposed imperialism, whether our own or foreign; and

Whereas conflicting reports are constantly being made by the executive departments and bureaus as to conditions in Europe, understanding of which is essential to intelligent legislation on the part of the Congress; and

Whereas a general peace conference has been proposed by our State Department in the near future to conclude settlements, on the justice and stability of which the future

peace of the United States will depend: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That a committee be appointed from both Houses of Congress composed of two members each from the Committees of Foreign Relations, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Judiciary, Appropriations, and Education and Labor from the Senate and the corresponding committees from the House, to go to Europe with the aid of the American military government and report back to both Houses not later than July 1 on European conditions that bear upon American policies with respect to loans, credits, food, military occupations, and the basis of a just and lasting peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) submitted by Mr. Langer, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Langer. Mr. President, I was one of the two Senators who voted against the United Nations. On that occasion, in the 3- or 4-minute speech which I made, I stated that the United Nations would never be a success with the veto power as a part of it. I say, Mr. President, that history has borne me out.

For the reasons which I now state, I oppose the pending bill. I am opposed to the draft. When it comes to the drafting of human beings, I say that the war is over.

Mr. La Follette obtained the floor.

Mr. Revercomb. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. La Follette. I yield.

Mr. Revercomb. On behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Wilson], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Wherry], and myself, I wish to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill. I do not know whether it is in order at this time, until we dispose of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in order at this time, because there is pending an amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Gurney].

Mr. Revercomb. I will offer the amendment when the pending amendment is disposed of.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. La Follette. Mr. President, I desire to set forth briefly my views and conclusions concerning the pending legislation to extend the Selective Service Act. I want to address myself squarely to the facts and issues as I see them.

There has been too much loose talk on this subject. Some intellectual sophistries have made false and malicious statements that Members of Congress have their eyes exclusively on future elections—that they know draft extension is necessary but lack sufficient courage to vote their convictions. Administration spokesmen, too, have added to the confusion. Apparently now we are being subjected to a campaign to convince those in service and their relatives that many of those now in the armed services cannot be released unless and until Congress grants this draft extension.

I do not accuse the War Department or anyone else of purposely confusing the

facts and issues involved in this legislation, but I do say that the sequence of events has created a serious confusion in the mind of the general public. However, if someone had deliberately set out to confuse the public and thereby engender a natural fear that draft extension was the only safe course, it could not have been done more effectively. In a situation analogous to the confusion that accompanied the demobilization plans—and the much-revised draft standards, too—the War Department and other administration officials have presented so many different stories and so many different sets of figures that a thoroughly confused public does not know what to believe.

Fortunately, the issues involved in this legislation are indeed simple and straight-forward compared with the complex matters of public policy that the Senate has had under consideration during the past weeks. Basically, the Congress has only to make a factual determination of the military needs, balance that off against the best estimates of available manpower by voluntary recruiting, and then make a finding concerning the necessity of extending compulsory military service. It is just that simple. It is a decision that can and should be reached on the basis of facts—but the Congress must have all the facts, not made-to-order arguments or facts.

I am not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, but from my examination of the testimony before the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and the House, I have come to the conclusion that the clear-cut opinions of those testifying in behalf of draft extension are not backed up by clear-cut evidence. The most favorable evaluation of the supporting data is to judge them inconclusive. The War Department's own estimates, when carefully analyzed, can be used to present an entirely different case than the one which it has attempted to make before the two committees of the Congress.

First of all, before delving into the various facts and figures, I want to pose the question, What is the basic philosophy behind this bill? Is it intended as a temporary measure to bridge a gap in our military manpower needs? Or is it the opening wedge by the military to establish permanent peacetime conscription in the United States?

I am singularly impressed by the fact that the original request by those who wanted to extend the draft was that the extension be continued for an indefinite period. General Hershey persisted in urging an indefinite extension before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, when other spokesmen were willing to take less. Even more damaging and better illustrative of the basic philosophy behind this bill are the data submitted to the committee by General Textor.

For the benefit of those who did not hear or read this testimony, it should be stated that General Textor made a special manpower study, by and with the consent of the Secretary of War, but independent of the official estimates. His study made a very convenient situation for administration spokesmen, who could

choose the favorable facts from each without trying to reconcile the two.

General Textor did not make the admission that it was War Department thinking that the draft should be extended indefinitely, but his methods of forecasting did that for him. By the General's formulas, we face a steep decline in the size of a volunteer army that can be maintained. By his formulas, there seems to be no hope whatsoever for a tapering-off of compulsory service. In fact, the need by his formulas becomes greater for more and more conscripts.

From the methods employed in the other War Department estimates, it is not possible to make similar analysis, but it is significant to my mind that these estimates, too, admit of no temporary crisis that will be met by a temporary extension of selective service.

The point I am trying to make is this: If the War Department is right in its estimates and philosophy concerning the need for selective service, then the Congress and the country should know right now that the arguments made for this extension of the draft can be made again for a permanent peacetime draft. If it is not a temporary program, then, one way or the other, Congress should be laying the groundwork now for a peacetime program—not a postponement of the issue for a year, and a postponement of all the uncertainties that hang over those of draft age.

Personally, I am not willing to admit that we cannot have an adequate and successful army by voluntary enlistments. I do not concur in the pessimistic outlook of the War Department or their proposed easy way to raise and maintain an army.

If we are ever going to get rid of the military hang-over of war, now is the time to cut loose from conscription and begin to build a voluntary army for the future security and protection of the United States, as well as for the replacement of those now in the service.

One of the primary arguments made in behalf of this bill is the argument that a strong army is necessary if we are to assume our proper role in world affairs. Then the immediate assumption is made that a voluntary army cannot be strong enough or, secondly, that it would be a psychological weakness to begin to prepare for peace while there are any war clouds on the horizon. These are good superficial arguments, but anyone who stops to reflect for a few minutes will agree that our national strength in manpower for any emergency in the near future does not lie in the few additional conscripts, to be made up largely of teen-agers, whom we could train in the next year. Our national strength and manpower reservoir for any emergency needs in the near future are the trained millions who have just come out of actual combat in this war. If we pass up the opportunity now to make the transition to a peacetime army while we have this reservoir, we shall be jeopardizing our security sometime in the future, if and when we make the transition without this reservoir of strength to fall back on in case of a real national emergency.

I take little stock, Mr. President, in the argument that we can bluff the other nations of the world by the utilization of the method of extending the draft. We shall not fool anyone by trying to play a psychological international poker game.

To get back to the first assumption, namely, that a volunteer army cannot be strong, I wish to emphasize, in the first place, that even the military leaders of our Nation will admit that, man for man, a volunteer army is better than a conscript army. The question then arises, How many men can we get by voluntary recruitment, and how far short is that of our needs? Let us examine the estimates of the War Department.

I may say that in many years in the Senate, I have seen many estimates come in from the Government departments. As might be expected, many of the estimates have later proved to be very much in error. I am not critical of this situation, because usually a good guess is better than nothing at all. But this experience does make me skeptical of leaning too heavily on any estimates that may be subject to a large margin of error. That is precisely the situation that confronts us with regard to the War Department estimates in connection with this question.

A year ago the Army estimated that no more than 300,000 enlistments could be had by July 1, 1946. Actually, the enlistments will be about 800,000. Missing the mark by 500,000 men is not very close estimating. Of course, it is true that the 300,000 estimate was made before the liberal recruiting act was passed. But if that substantial increase can be attributed to the recruiting act, then a policy just slightly more generous can bring us more men than we need. And this figure of 800,000 does not include 150,000 officers, most of whom are serving voluntarily.

What is the magnitude of the predicted gap between enlistments and required strength a year from now, on July 1, 1947? The War Department has two figures: General Paul's shortage figure of 165,000 men, and General Textor's shortage figure of 51,000. To be brought up to date with the stop-gap extension of the draft, both of these estimates would have to be reduced by the number of persons drafted between May 15 and July 1 of this year.

Mr. President, if we compare the size of these figures with the Army's margin of error in their last year's estimates, we have good reason to wonder why anyone can attach any great significance to these anticipated shortages. And we can go much further than that if we wish to get into further refinements. We can show, for example, that these figures fall to include 50,000 Philippine Scouts. We can show how the anticipated shortages could easily be made up by making the Army more attractive.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the Senator's mention of 50,000 Philippine Scouts, who have been authorized to be raised for service as occupation forces in the Pacific area.

Does the Senator know why that number should not be increased, because vastly more than 50,000 Philippine Scouts served in the recent war?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the Senator has made a very interesting point.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the Selective Service System last year had a budget of about \$49,000,000, and that did not include all the costs, because General Hershey testified that he also had about 500 men in uniform, the average rank of which was "somewhere between major and lieutenant colonel." If this \$49,000,000 were divided among the maximum estimated shortage, it could supply an enlistment bonus of \$300 to each such man. My own personal opinion is that a much smaller inducement than that could bring in more than enough, whether it be in the form of increased pay or any other form of inducement.

All sorts of dire predictions were made about the probable decline in enlistments after the passage of the stop-gap legislation on May 15. Yet, if the figures quoted in the press are correct, there has been only a very minor drop in enlistments, and present levels are still substantially above all previous and recent estimates of the War Department.

Those in favor of the draft extension have been citing enlistment figures showing that the rate of enlistment has dropped from 185,000 men last November to 43,000 in May. The plain fact is that the Army could not use and does not want men in the numbers that were enlisting last November as a permanent army. With the November rate of enlistments, we could maintain an Army of three or four million men, depending on the terms of enlistment. Furthermore, the Army has consistently underestimated enlistments. Even in the recent months, which are alleged to be such a disappointment, look at the Army's estimates and the actual enlistments: For April the Army's estimate was 56,000; the actual figure was 63,000. For May the Army's estimate was 39,000; the actual figure was 43,000.

Even this allegedly low level is substantially above what the Army concedes is necessary to reach its requirements in the next year or more. What are the Army's estimates based on? They are based on a minimum enlistment in 1947 of 12,500 men a month.

The fact is that even back in 1937 we were getting about half that many, with the totally negative approach and emphasis existing at that time in regard to enlistment. There is absolutely no reason in my judgment, why we cannot maintain the enlistment rate figure somewhere between 12,500, which the Army says is too low, and 43,000, which is more than ample if sustained.

Several other factors should be taken into consideration. I have no evidence to prove it; but from my casual observations, personally, of both newspaper advertisements and radio programs, I wish to say that it appears to me that the Army has not been conducting as vigorous or as widespread a campaign for enlistments, during recent months, as it was conducting during the past fall and early winter.

Furthermore, it should be noted that both the intelligence and physical standards for the Army have been changed in recent months. Physical standards have been relaxed, while intelligence standards have been raised 10 points. It is my understanding that draftees do not have to pass the intelligence test for induction into the Army, whereas volunteers must. Figures cited in the hearings by General Paul were that about 10 percent of the volunteers in March were rejected for their inability to meet the increased intelligence standard.

On the other side of the picture—that of requirements—I should like to make the observation that all of the estimates on deficits are based on a magical requirements figure of 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947, which is, after all, merely another estimate that may be widely in error.

As presently broken down by the War Department, that figure contemplates a disposition of about one-half of those overseas, and the remainder in the United States and en route. I have seen no justification whatsoever of the contention that such large numbers should be in training or stationed in this country.

In fact, at no time in the hearings on this bill was there any discussion as to how this figure was set, or how it might be affected by changing international events. Certainly it must be tied in with our over-all foreign policy, but we have been given no inkling in the hearings how this would be affected quantitatively by any of various contingencies.

It should be recalled that the figures on occupational requirements have undergone very drastic revision within a few months time. The Army started out with an estimated requirement of 1,950,000 men for July 1, 1946. A few months later this estimate was twice revised and brought down to 1,550,000.

Again, this emphasizes the point which I tried to make before. Here we have a revision on the estimated requirements amounting to 400,000 men. Previously, we revised the error in the estimates of enlistments by 500,000 men. If that is as close as the Army can come in its estimates of requirements and availables, it is wholly unreasonable to attach undue significance to any alleged deficiencies by voluntary recruitments which, by comparison, are very small. One of the basic laws of statistics is the fact that an estimate is worthless if the probable margin of error of the estimate is substantially greater than the estimate itself.

Let us look at the present size and composition of our Army. On July 1, there will be about 800,000 volunteer enlisted men and 150,000 officers. That is a total of 950,000 men—and not counting a single draftee. The War Department estimates that a year from now that total will have dropped to 819,000, again excluding all draftees. A large part of that decline would be the release of 50,000 officers to bring the Army into better balance.

In other words, at the present time, our volunteer strength is almost up to the level which the Army seeks to attain 1 year from now. And it is the Army's position that we cannot maintain that volunteer strength, that the situation

will steadily deteriorate. In other words, it is not a question of attaining a given goal of voluntary enlistments. We have practically done that already. It is a question of maintaining that size against the effects of attrition and completion of enlistment terms.

In any way we look at it, we cannot change the basic proposition that we are making a choice here and now as to whether or not we are going to have permanent conscription. To have to use conscription to attain a given-sized army is one thing; to have to use conscription to maintain a given size is quite another thing and can only imply the continued and indefinite use of compulsion.

If we ever hope to get back to a voluntary army, now is the time to break away from the draft. There is absolutely no reason why we cannot have an army of any reasonable size, provided we are willing to increase the pay of men in the service and increase the respectability and economic opportunities offered by military service so that it may compete in those respects with other lines of work and with the professions. I wish to say, Mr. President, that we should pay for this service what it is worth. Why should we not? Why should we expect to obtain men for police service overseas at a lower rate of pay than we are willing to pay men who are in the police service of the municipalities of this country? Why should we expect to obtain men for overseas police duties at a rate of pay which is less than we are now paying for farm labor on most of our farms? I think the reluctance to pay for service in the armed forces what it is worth is a carry-over from the time when we had a small standing army and when we were not utilizing the highly mechanized and technical devices of war which are now necessary in connection with the maintenance of a modern army.

Mr. President, what is the outlook for the draftees in the Army who are anxious to get out? We now have about 600,000 draftees. Let me make it very clear that I believe that the Army should be required to discharge those who have had 18 months of service, and those who are fathers, if they wish to get out.

I have already pointed out that from a purely statistical standpoint we could release all our draftees now, and still have an Army approximately the size of the contemplated peacetime Army. Of course, from a practical standpoint, there must be a satisfactory transition because an army is an organizational unit, not composed merely of numbers that can be shifted freely from job to job. Furthermore, there may be some transitional needs—some war wind-up jobs to be done in the coming year.

According to General Textor's estimates, we can release all those who have had 18 months or more of service and incur an additional deficit of only 170,000 men. In other words, we will be able to release during the year July 1, 1946, to July 1, 1947, 570,000 of the 600,000 inducted men now in service. The other 400,000 men to be released are already included in the estimate, having served more than 24 months.

The remaining 30,000 will not have served 18 months a year from now.

These statistics clearly point out that the additional manpower burden of releasing those who have served only 18 months is relatively small compared with the immediate job ahead of releasing the large bulk of draftees who have or will have served longer than that by July 1, 1947.

It is grossly misleading to say that we must have draftees to replace those men. By the Army's own estimates, about 500,000 of those Army jobs must be eliminated in order that the Army may get down to its peacetime size. The only effect whatsoever that the immediate releases can have is to accelerate slightly the demobilization schedule within the next year. It will have no effect on our planned ultimate peacetime strength.

No estimates were given in the hearings concerning the number of fathers who might be affected by a policy allowing their release.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the Senator's understanding that the bill in its present form authorizes the drafting and induction of men who have already served in the Army and have been released?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am apprehensive that it does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I may say that the bill in its present form provided for that very thing. However, the senior Senator from Colorado, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHEERRY] have been working out an amendment which will cure that situation. It will be offered before the bill is finally acted upon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, many fathers would also be affected by the 18 months' provision, and this figure, whatever it may be, cannot be added simply to the other estimates, because there would be too much duplication. I think it is safe to say, however, that because of the policy in recent months of deferring fathers, the number with very short service who would be released would be in all probability very small.

The hue and cry which the War Department raised on these issues make me recall the same hue and cry which was raised when excuses were being given about demobilization problems. It appears to me that the only way the country can be assured we now have a satisfactory transition to a peacetime army is for the Congress to give a clear mandate to the War Department to follow certain explicit rules.

It has been estimated by General Textor before the House Military Affairs Committee that a 10-percent increase in base pay would result in an estimated 30-percent increase in volunteers. A more substantial increase than that might actually bring us to the point where we could set our standards for the Army much higher than they are at present. There is no reason whatsoever why the Army should be required to accept the dregs of the employment market rather than compete on equal terms with other prospective employers.

I have joined with the able senior Senator from Colorado in having an amendment drafted which proposes to raise the age in the first four categories to the same figure which was adopted by the House, and I very much hope that when the proper time comes that amendment will be agreed to, because I am convinced that if it shall be, we will have as a result of voluntary enlistments all the men we need, not only for security but to provide adequate replacements.

Mr. President, I think in this country that is a much sounder program than the one which is proposed by the pending amendment, to draft, in time of peace, teen-agers, many of whom, at least one-half of whom, will be sent overseas to foreign countries for police duty. I say that the United States has not reached the point when it must rely on its teen-agers because it is unwilling to pay adequately for the service the Nation requires.

Senators may say what they please about the effect they think this will have upon the youth of the land, but I advance it as my sober and deliberate conclusion that taking teen-agers, giving them a brief period of training, and then sending them abroad for police duties in foreign countries, where they will be away from the environment of their schools, their homes, and their country, can have nothing but a demoralizing effect upon them.

I heard a Senator say a few days ago that he thought that at 18 a man's character and his habits had been established. I submit that is not the experience of all of us. We know that is not true. I say this policy also involves the interruption of the education of thousands upon thousands of these youths. We sacrificed that educational opportunity for them during the war because we had to do it as a matter of necessity, but we do not have to do it now, and it will be a tragic mistake to the future security of the Nation if we do it now, because we have already drained off, as the result of our wartime draft policy, those recruitments in the field of science which the recent developments of applied science have demonstrated are the avenue to national security.

Now it is being proposed that we continue that policy for another year, preventing these youths from going on to higher education. I submit that in the end it will serve no good purpose so far as the security of the United States is concerned, and individually the experience cannot be good for young men of the ages between 18 and 21.

Mr. President, I shall perhaps have something more to say on this subject when the question of pay comes up, but I cannot support the pending amendment for the reasons which I have given.

#### CONFIRMATION OF ARMY NOMINATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as in executive session, I should like to report a series of nominations for promotions and transfers in the Army, and I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed at this time. I make the request so as to save something like three or four hundred dollars in printing costs. I assure all Senators that

this has been done before, and that there are nothing but routine nominations on the list.

Mr. WHITE. Are they merely routine promotions and transfers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They are promotions and transfers in the lower grades.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Are any general officers involved?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; no general officers are involved, none higher than lieutenant colonels and majors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and, without objection the nominations are confirmed.

#### EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LAND AT THE BENICIA ARSENAL, CALIF.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1776) to authorize the exchange of certain land at the Benicia Arsenal, Calif., which were, on page 1, line 8, to strike out "one and eighty-eight one-hundredths" and insert "two and ten one-hundredths", and on the same page, line 10, to strike out all after "accept" over to and including "vicinity" in line 2 of page 2 and insert "a perpetual easement for right-of-way purposes for roadways, trackage, drainage ditches, and similar purposes over, across, and upon nineteen acres of land owned by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, situated in the same vicinity."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator give us a brief explanation of what the bill is?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill provides for the transfer of certain property to the Southern Pacific Railway Co. for right-of-way, for purposes of perpetual easement across and upon a portion of the Benicia Arsenal in California. It is a routine request.

Mr. WHITE. The motion is to concur in the House amendments?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The motion is to concur in the House amendments, which are merely corrective in character and have to do with a more exact description of the property concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

#### CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise not to make a speech, but to offer a resolution which speaks for itself. It is my answer to the question as to who is telling the truth in regard to what happened in the settlement of the railroad strike on last Saturday, May 25. I think such a resolution as I now offer is called for. It will supply the answer to the charges which have been made. I am ready to prove my charge that the President did not fulfill his clear obligations to the public when he made his speech on Saturday, May 25, 1946, in that he did not inform them that there was no

danger of a railroad strike after 4 p. m., and that fact was well known by his advisers before noon on Saturday. The resolution reads:

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States request its Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation forthwith of the events of Saturday, May 25, and prior thereto leading up to the settlement of the railroad strike, said investigation to include an investigation of all charges that the administration knew or should have known several hours before the President's speech that the strike would not continue after 4 p. m. Further, That said investigation include the examination by the order of the committee of not only the representatives of the brotherhoods but also of the President's advisers and such Members of the Congress as well as others who can offer testimony and evidence based on their knowledge of the surrounding facts and circumstances or events that occurred on Saturday, May 25 and prior thereto in relation to the railroad strike. Further that all testimony shall be taken by the committee from witnesses under oath.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 278) was received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 470. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of W. P. Richardson, as successor and assignee of W. P. Richardson & Co., of Tampa, Fla.;

S. 769. An act for the relief of H. H. Ashbrook, and others;

S. 913. An act to protect scenic values along and tributary to the Catalina Highway within the Coronado National Forest, Ariz.;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke;

S. 1286. An act for the relief of Sam Bechtold;

S. 1605. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities;

S. 1802. An act to provide for the delivery of custody of certain articles of historic interest from the U. S. S. Nevada and the U. S. S. Wyoming to the State of Nevada and the State of Wyoming, respectively;

S. 1805. An act to authorize the promotion of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war;

S. 1854. An act to establish the civilian position of academic dean of the Postgraduate School of the Naval Academy and compensation therefor;

S. 1862. An act to repeal section 1548 Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 592);

S. 1871. An act to authorize the conveyance of a parcel of land at the naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., to the American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.;

S. 1959. An act to authorize the payment of additional uniform gratuity to Reserve officers commissioned from the status of aviation cadets; and

S. 1978. An act to authorize the restoration of Philip Niekum, Jr., to the active list of the United State Navy with appropriate rank and restoration of pay and allowances; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission.

#### EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] on page 1, after line 6.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Murray
Andrews	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Austin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Bridges	Hoey	Radcliffe
Briggs	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Saltonstall
Butler	La Follette	Shipstead
Byrd	Langer	Smith
Capehart	Lucas	Stanfill
Capper	McCarran	Stewart
Connally	McClellan	Taft
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McKellar	Tobey
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Eastland	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
George	Mitchell	Wheeler
Gerry	Moore	White
Green	Morse	Wiley
Gurney	Murdock	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there have been some inquiries made as to the purpose of the pending amendment; so, briefly, I desire to say that the amendment seeks to restore the minimum age limit provided in the original draft law, making it 18 years. The 6 weeks' extension, as agreed to on May 14, limited induction to the ages between 20 and 29. Therefore, it is necessary to present this amendment at this time in order to restore the minimum age to 18 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is the yeas-and-nays vote on the Gurney amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is the yeas-and-nays vote on the amendment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] who, if present, would vote as I shall vote. I am, therefore, free to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

I also announce that on this question the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

I announce further that on this question the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is unavoidably detained. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. If present, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 26, as follows:

## YEAS—53

Austin	Gurney	Murdock
Ball	Hart	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Bridges	Hayden	Pepper
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Radeliffe
Buck	Hill	Reed
Byrd	Huffman	Robertson
Capehart	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Lucas	Smith
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Tobey
Eastland	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Wagner
Fulbright	Mead	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Morse	

## NAYS—26

Alken	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Andrews	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Brooks	La Follette	Stewart
Burch	Langer	Taft
Bushfield	McCarran	Tunnell
Butler	McClellan	Walsh
Capper	Millikin	Wheeler
George	Moore	Wilson
Hoey	O'Daniel	

## NOT VOTING—17

Bailey	Gossett	Taylor
Bankhead	Guffey	Thomas, Okla.
Bilbo	Hatch	Wherry
Brewster	Murray	Willis
Carville	Myers	Young
Chavez	Revercomb	

So Mr. GURNEY's amendment was agreed to, as follows:

On page 1, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. (a) So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3 (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 18 and 45 at the time fixed for his registration, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

On page 1, line 7, delete "Sec. 2." and insert in lieu thereof "(b)."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 22, on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 5. (a) Section 5 (e) (3) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children dependent upon him for support, or with whom he maintains a bona fide family relationship in their home, shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term 'child' includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped."

(b) Section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this is merely a perfecting amendment. This amendment merely revises the provisions of the amendment by the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 159 concerning the induction of fathers so as to preclude the induction of fathers only who have a child or children dependent upon them for support or with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. The amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 159, as passed by the House of Representatives, would prohibit the induction of all fathers regardless of whether their child or children are dependent upon them for support or whether they maintain a bona fide relationship in their homes with such child or children.

Of course, elsewhere in the bill fathers are prohibited from being inducted, and all fathers in the Army and Navy will be discharged immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is merely a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 16, it is proposed to delete the word "proviso" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and fifth provisos."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this amendment is merely designed to correct an omission which was inadvertently made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated, relating to the rates of pay. The amendment is dated April 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, beginning with line 4, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 20 on page 5, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 8. (a) The first paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, \$165; enlisted men of the second grade, \$135; enlisted men of the third grade, \$115; enlisted men of the fourth grade, \$94; enlisted men of the fifth grade, \$82; enlisted men of the sixth grade, \$70; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, \$65. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of \$150."

(b) The third paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his grade for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That retired enlisted men heretofore or hereafter retired with credit for 30 years' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and who served beyond the continental limits of the United States between 1898 and 1912, such service having been computed under previous laws as double time toward retirement, shall be entitled to receive the maximum retired pay now provided for the grade in which retired."

(c) Section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1274; 34 U. S. C. 701), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. That the band of the United States Marine Corps shall consist of one leader whose pay and allowances shall be those of a captain in the Marine Corps; one second leader whose pay shall be \$220 per month and who shall have the allowances of a sergeant major; ten principal musicians whose pay shall be \$180 per month; 25 first-class musicians whose pay shall be \$150 per month; 20 second-class musicians whose pay shall be

\$120 per month; and 10 third-class musicians whose pay shall be \$102 per month; such musicians of the band to have the allowances of a sergeant: *Provided*, That the second leader and musicians of the band shall receive the same increases for length of service and the same enlistment allowance or gratuity for reenlisting as is now or may hereafter be provided for other enlisted men in the Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That the pay authorized herein shall apply in computing the pay of former members of the band now on the retired list and who have been retired since June 30, 1922: *Provided further*, That in the event of promotion of the second leader or a musician of the band, to leader of the band, all service as such second leader, or as such musician of the band, or both, shall be counted in computing longevity increase in pay: *And provided further*, That hereafter during concert tours approved by the President, members of the Marine Band shall suffer no loss of allowances."

SEC. 9. (a) The second and third paragraphs of section 8 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of \$2,340 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters and chief engineers in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than 10 years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of \$2,520 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay for the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, 77th Cong.)."

(b) The seventh paragraph of section 8 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of \$550 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above \$550."

SEC. 10. The first paragraph of section 7 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be \$6,600; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be \$8,800. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this act

for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period."

SEC. 11. The second paragraph of section 1 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The first period, \$2,160; the second period, \$2,400; the third period, \$2,640; the fourth period, \$2,880; the fifth period, \$3,120; and the sixth period, \$4,400."

SEC. 12. The increases in pay specified in this act shall be applicable to the active duty, retired, retirement, or retainer pay of all persons whose pay is governed by, or by reference to, those sections of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, which are amended by this act.

SEC. 13. The increases in pay provided by this act shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following its enactment, and no increase in pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I discussed in a general way this amendment yesterday. I merely rise to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I think the amendment will require some explanation. Will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the distinguished Senator from South Dakota permit me to make the request when he has finished his explanation?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. GURNEY. Not just yet.

Mr. President, I wish to perfect my amendment. This amendment is the one dated April 19, copies of which are on the desks of Senators. It has to do with the pay raise of enlisted men and officers.

On page 6 of the amendment, in line 22, it is provided that these rates of pay shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following enactment of the bill. I am advised by the finance officers of both the Army and the Navy that they can make it effective on the first day of the first calendar month following enactment of the bill. So I ask permission to perfect my amendment by changing the word "second" in line 22 on page 6, to "first."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is not necessary. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment and the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to make one further change in the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I did not understand the first change which the Senator made.

Mr. GURNEY. The change provides that the pay raise shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following enactment, not on the first day of the second calendar month. The change occurs in line 22, on page 6, of the amendment dated April 19.

On page 6, line 14, is found the language "the third period, \$2,640." That applies to the pay of a captain, and to the pay of the corresponding grade in the Navy. It has been thought advisable that

the amount should be increased from \$2,640 to \$2,760, giving a captain a 15-percent raise, while a lieutenant receives 20 percent, and all grades above captain receive 10 percent. Therefore I ask permission to change the amendment in line 14, on page 6 of the amendment, so as to read "the third period, \$2,760."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment, and the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the large schedule, copies of which I have had passed around. The committee-approved bill, Senate bill 2057 as it appears on the desks of Senators, the original bill approved by the committee, would cost a total of \$275,000,000. That is the increase in pay for the next fiscal year, as recommended in the first place by the committee. That is to be found at the foot of column 2. It will be noticed, by going to the top, where the figures for enlistments in the seventh grade are shown—in other words, for privates—that a 30-percent increase is provided. That is the amount recommended by the committee.

Then, coming down the list, we find that privates first class will receive a 30-percent increase, corporals a 24-percent increase, sergeants a 20-percent increase, and the higher grades of sergeants will receive 12½ percent, 3 percent, nothing, and 2 percent.

After the committee had approved these figures and had reported these rates of pay, the House acted on their bill, known as House bill 6084. The House of Representatives approved not only increases in pay for the enlisted men but also increases in pay for the officers; namely, for second lieutenants, in the Army, and for officers of comparable grade in the Navy, a 20-percent increase; for captains in the Army, and the corresponding Navy rank of full lieutenant, 10 percent.

Therefore, I believe it would be best for the Senate to consider the rates of pay already agreed to by the House of Representatives, and then make the rates of pay for privates, corporals, and sergeants the proper size, and increasing to the figure \$180 a month, as noted in column 5, for second lieutenants. There should be proper spacing between the pay of sergeants and the pay of lieutenants. In other words, there should not be too much of a jump between the pay for each grade.

Therefore, in column 5, I have started with the figure approved by the committee, namely, \$65 for privates, and then I give the same percentage of increase for privates first class. So it reads as follows: Sixty-five dollars for privates, \$70 for privates first class—I think almost all enlisted men reach the grade of private first class after 4 months in the service; then \$82 for corporals, \$94 for sergeants, \$115 for staff sergeants, \$135 for technical sergeants, \$150 for acting chief petty officers; and for master sergeants and chief petty officers \$165, leaving a \$15 difference between the pay of a master sergeant and the pay of a second lieutenant.

We have gone carefully through the figures for the pay of chief petty officers in the Army and Navy and the Marine

Corps and warrant officers, and in column 5 we have included all of them in the list, properly spaced, I believe, up to the point where we reach the pay of captains in the Army and officers of comparable rank in the Navy, and we made that figure \$220.

Without that 10-percent increase in pay for Army captains, the amendment presently before the Senate provides for an increase of \$474,000,000 for the next fiscal year. It is to be remembered that that is not the full amount of pay for those in the Army and the Navy; it is simply the increase.

It has been thought that an increase of \$474,000,000 is a considerable increase. It is considerably less than the House figure, which appears in column 6. As the Senate knows, the House began with a figure of \$75 a month for the pay for a private. The largest part of the increase comes from the increases in the pay of those in the lower grades of the enlisted service, because there are more of them. The House bill would require a total increase of \$632,000,000.

So we have the original Senate Military Affairs Committee recommendation of an increase of \$275,000,000, which is at the low end of the scale, and then we have the House figure, at the top of the scale, of \$632,000,000. My recommendation, and the amendment presently before the Senate, is for an increase of \$474,000,000. At least the major part of that increase will go to the enlisted men; \$378,000,000 will go to the enlisted men, in the way of an increase. Ninety-six million dollars will go to the officers.

Other amendments were offered prior to the time when the bill was taken up on the floor of the Senate, and since that time other amendments have been offered, both today and yesterday. I do not know what the cost of their provisions would be, but I do know the actual increases in cost which would be required for every amendment which was submitted prior to the taking up of this measure last Saturday.

So, Mr. President, I am convinced that we shall have a real rate of pay to offer to the enlisted men, and a nice increase for the officers—in short, a change that will be satisfactory all around.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Are the rates of pay for officers and enlisted men, as provided in the measure before us, to be permanent, or are they to apply for only a temporary period?

Mr. GURNEY. They would be permanent, until Congress might agree to look into the matter further.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes—until Congress repeals this measure.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. So the Senator proposes to raise the pay of everyone in the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there any provision for compulsory allotments to families, to those at home? Such allotments should be provided for in the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. We are discharging all the fathers.

Mr. CONNALLY. I care not whether the allotments are made in the case of fathers or in other cases. Regardless of that, the families of the men should be sent at least half of the pay provided by this measure, because, if the men are going to receive any real benefit from the increased pay, that is one thing, but if they are going to throw it away, that is something else. The Senator knows what they do in foreign countries. I have seen them. I say to the Senator that I regret very much that a temporary limit is not placed on the pay provision, because these rates of pay are even higher than the wartime rates.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Let me say that I am in complete agreement with the thoughts of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then I hope the Senator will let those thoughts actuate him into offering an amendment to limit the increases to January 1, 1948, or to January 1, 1949, if he wishes to make it that. But for God's sake do not sacrifice the system, merely for the purpose of making service in the Army the most attractive job in the country.

Mr. GURNEY. To provide for the length of time for which the increases in the rate of pay should last would not affect the principle.

Mr. CONNALLY. Now is a good time to start.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will offer an amendment—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate has a Committee on Military Affairs. I do not try to run its business. It seems to me that some member of that committee should offer the amendments. I am an Army man; I believe in the Army, and all that; but everyone knows that the Army of the United States and the Senate of the United States are among the most extravagant branches of the Government service; they spend money like water, all over the world. I have seen a good deal of that.

I hope the Senator will not consider my remarks as at all unfriendly or caustic, but I mean them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am waiting to obtain the floor. As soon as the Senator from South Dakota concludes, I shall offer a substitute for the amendment the Senator has offered.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to take a little more time to make a complete presentation of my amendment, and then I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Why should we increase the pay of brigadier generals, lieutenant generals, admirals, and so on? The pending measure would increase their pay and would place it on a higher level than even that of the pay which the Members of the Senate receive. In addition,

officers receive numerous allowances; in many instances they are furnished the houses in which they live, and they receive various other allowances. I think it would be a mistake to increase the salaries of the officers of the higher ranks.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in answer to the point made by the Senator from Montana, let me say that our committee reported Senate bill 2057 with the salaries which appear in column 2 of the tabulation, and it will be noted that the committee did not recommend an increase in pay for officers.

Mr. WHEELER. However, I notice that the Senator's amendment, as I understand it, does provide for an increase in the pay of officers.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct; and the Senate has a perfect right to vote down my amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that, and that is the way I intend to vote, insofar as the proposal to increase the pay of these officers is concerned.

I am in favor of increasing the wages of the enlisted men.

Mr. GURNEY. My justification for offering, in my amendment, a proposal for 10 percent and 20 percent increases in the pay of officers, is the fact that the House of Representatives passed the bill granting such increases in pay for officers. Speaking personally, not speaking for the committee, I say that I believe the officers are entitled to the proposed increases. That is why I have included the House figures in the amendment which is now before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order for me to request the yeas and nays at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not unless the Senator from South Dakota yields for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from South Dakota permit me to ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Is it in order to ask for the yeas and nays before all substitutes for, or amendments to my amendment, have been offered and acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ordering of the yeas and nays would not affect the offer of any further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that I have been informed by the Presiding Officer that the ordering of the yeas and nays would not affect the offer of further amendments, or substitutes for my amendment, and therefore I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for the purpose which he stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the yeas and nays are ordered on the pending amendment, will

that also apply to a vote on the substitute to the bill which the Senator from Colorado will offer as soon as he obtains the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. It will apply only to the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What would happen to the order for the yeas and nays if the substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado should be adopted? What would then be done about the yeas and nays? It seems to me that the Senator from South Carolina should wait until the substitute to which I have referred has been submitted to the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand, my request for the yeas and nays on the Gurney amendment would, if granted, not affect any other amendment to the bill. I had amendments of my own which I withdrew yesterday. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Gurney amendment, an amendment which was agreed to by several members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ordering of the yeas and nays would not prevent the Senator from Colorado from offering a substitute and asking for the yeas and nays on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course not.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kansas is somewhat confused with regard to the status of the pending bill, and the amendment now being discussed by the Senator from South Dakota. Usually, a bill comes to the floor of the Senate as a committee bill. I have understood that the bill now being discussed by the Senator from South Dakota is a committee bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a committee bill.

Mr. REED. I have now gathered from the last remarks of the Senator from South Dakota that he has offered an amendment. It has not been stated, and I do not clearly understand whether it has the approval of the committee, or whether it is an amendment which the Senator offers on behalf of his individual self.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has the approval of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to advise the Senator from Kansas as soon as we have had Senate action on the request of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been requested with reference to what question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the question of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded? The yeas and nays are ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I only ask that the yeas and nays be had at the conclusion of the debate on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is subject to further debate.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am glad to reply to the Senator from Kansas who seems to be somewhat confused at this time by my amendment.

Senate bill 2057 was reported to the Senate on April 11. On April 19, about a week after our committee had acted, the House committee and the House itself approved a pay increase for enlisted men in the Army which was much larger than was recommended by our committee. There was also included a pay raise of 20 percent for the junior officers and 10 percent for the officers above the rank of lieutenant. Consequently, in order to get the Senate and the House together so that a bill could be presented to the Senate which would be sufficiently attractive from a pay standpoint to induce the enlistment of volunteers, a group of members of the Military Affairs Committee, with the help of both the Army and the Navy, worked out a new schedule which seemed to fit together the action of the other House and the Senate committee, and, as I have already stated, made the proper spacing between the grades of the enlisted men in both the Army and the Navy, and made proper spacing between the pay of enlisted men and officers.

Does that explanation satisfy the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas is struggling to get the matter clear in his mind. It is rather confusing to bring to the floor a bill which is supposed to be a committee bill, and then have the Senator in charge of the bill discuss an amendment to the bill without informing the Senate whether the amendment which he proposes has received the approval of the committee and, therefore, may be considered to be a committee amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. No, Mr. President; when I offered the amendment I stated that it was my personal amendment. I then explained what the committee had done in the first place, as shown in column 2 of the sheet lying before Senators. I then explained quite fully what the other House had done, and that is shown in column 6. My amendment would raise the pay, and the total cost is shown in column 5. The only purpose is to get the House action and the action of the Military Affairs Committee dovetailed together so that there may be presented to the Senate what is considered by several members of the committee and representatives of the Army and Navy to be a proper solution of the problem relating to the pay schedule.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, again I inquire whether the amendment which we are now discussing has or has not had the approval of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. GURNEY. The pending amendment has not received the approval of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, except in column 5, with regard to the top figure on the page of \$65. That figure is the same as the one approved by the committee as it will be found in column 2. Sixty-five dollars is the same for a private, \$70 is the same for a private first class, \$82 is the same for a cor-

poral, \$94 is the same for a sergeant, and there is a small difference with regard to staff sergeants, and on up.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, naturally, according to the procedure which is generally observed in the Senate, committee amendments are considered first. I would not understand that an amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, even though he is in charge of the bill, would have any different status so far as the bill is concerned than that of an amendment offered by any other Senator. Therefore, that is probably what has confused the Senator from Kansas who has been trying to keep track of this somewhat involved matter. We apparently are not following the usual procedure by which we consider and dispose of the committee amendments, and then take up amendments which may be offered on behalf of any Members of the Senate, whether by the Senator from South Dakota or a Senator from any other State.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Was the amendment which I have offered in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota offered an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment, did he not?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was to strike out sections 8 and 9 and substitute other language. The amendment is in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I believe I heard the Chair announce that the amendment was offered as a substitute for the committee amendment. It is not a committee amendment. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota would be an amendment to Senate bill 2057.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no committee amendments. The Chair should not have used the words committee amendment. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, as modified, is to strike out sections 8 and 9 and substitute other language.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, there is an amendment which the committee instructed me to offer, but it has not been printed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to have it clear that there is no committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inadvertently referred to the language of the bill as a committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then the parliamentary situation is, as I understand it, that the Senator from South Dakota has offered on his own behalf an amendment, and that it is now the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has made a correct statement.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to say to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], if the Senator from South Dakota will permit, that when the committee was considering the bill we had 4 or 5 versions of pay schedules before us, and it was agreed in the committee that the bill would be reported to the Senate, but that all members of the committee would be free to offer amendments to section 8, the pay schedule section of the bill. That is why so many versions are being offered.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado, because I know the committee did report, and there are on the desk, other pay schedules than the one suggested by me. For instance, the so-called Revercomb amendment is printed in column 7. There is an original schedule proposed by both the Army and the Navy, which appears in column 8. The proposal of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is listed in column 9. Then there are 2 from the House, in columns 10 and 11.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do we ever have the benefit of recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget on schedules of this nature?

Mr. GURNEY. There has been no report from the Bureau of the Budget on any of the pay schedules, so far as I know.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any definite recommendation from the War Department and the Navy Department?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; that appears in column 8, with a total cost of \$549,000,000. My proposal adds up to less than that, being a total of \$474,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did I understand the Senator to say that his proposal had been written in conjunction with consultations with the services?

Mr. GURNEY. With both services. Both the War and Navy Departments approve these schedules, and say they are properly spaced, and if we start with a certain figure for a private the correct amount is given to other enlisted men, officers, and field officers in accordance with their responsibilities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator one other question. As I understand the committee bill itself, the total increase is \$275,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct, as shown in column 2.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's proposal is \$474,000,000, as shown in column 5. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yet both of them have the same increases at the enlistment level. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the purpose of the increase primarily is to encourage enlistments, why is it necessary, then, to go beyond the figure recommended by the committee, inasmuch as that would establish precisely the same enlistment incentive?

Mr. GURNEY. It would not quite do that, because when a man enters the Army, if he knows he will be rewarded

with a higher rate of pay as he advances in rank, he might like to make the Army a career. But basically there is no more incentive in the amendment now pending than there was in the committee-approved bill, as shown in column 2, because they both provide \$65 for initial enlistment. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; but I do not think it quite explains why it is necessary for us to go beyond \$275,000,000 at the moment, inasmuch as our present primary purpose is enlistment incentive.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is correct, and that was the reason why I recommended the original amount in column 2, which totaled \$275,000,000.

The Senator must take into consideration the fact, however, that the House of Representatives started at a much higher figure, giving the private a 50-percent increase, while we recommend only 30 percent, and they also increase the pay of officers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that, but the Senate conferees will collide with the House on that subject. Perhaps that is an additional reason for clinging to the lower figure at the take-off, so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. GURNEY. Therefore, I recommended an initial rate for privates of \$65, which is the same figure the committee approved in the first place.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But the Senator's total recommendation is \$474,000,000, compared with \$275,000,000.

Mr. GURNEY. It is considerably more. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that a great portion of the \$474,000,000 is because of the House action adding \$96,000,000 of increase in officers' pay.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the precise point I make. I understand the purpose of the bill is enlistment incentive, but there is precisely the same enlistment incentive in the first four grades, which are entry grades, under the \$275,000,000 budget, as there is under the \$474,000,000 budget. So I find myself again puzzled as to why, at least, in the Senate's initial action, we should undertake to extend the original action of the committee on the \$275,000,000 proposal.

Mr. GURNEY. I can say to the Senator that I believe he is entirely justified in his statement, because it is my belief that an inductee or volunteer in 18 months of service will probably not reach a grade higher than that of sergeant or staff sergeant, the pay of which, under the committee bill would be, respectively, \$94 and \$106 a month. The only justification is to get the House and Senate committee figures more nearly together.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the function of a conference, and not the function of initial consideration on the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to call attention to the fact that what the Army and the Navy did was to recommend a 20 percent increase all down the line, and

for the higher officers \$800 a month. The Gurney amendment recommends for the enlistees the same the committee recommended, but it adds 10 percent to the pay of the higher officers.

I agree entirely with what the Senator from Michigan has said. I think we can justify an increase for the enlisted men, but I do not think we can go before the country at this time and advocate that the admirals and the generals, who are drawing good salaries at present, should get an increase of 10 percent or 20 percent, or any other increase. As I understand, the purpose is to get men to enlist in the Army and Navy. We do not need to pay an admiral 10 percent more in order to get him to enlist in the Navy.

Mr. GURNEY. Again I answer the Senator from Montana, by saying that this proposal incorporates the House action, so far as officers' pay is concerned. Then I call attention to the fact that for junior grade officers, \$180 a month is not very much, in view of present living costs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the Senator from Michigan has put his finger upon the very heart of this situation. The whole purpose of any kind of raise at this time is to induce enlistments, to invite enlistments. Therefore it seems to me that the scale of pay contained in the bill reported from the committee, as well as the scale of pay contained in the substitute which I shall offer shortly, being the same, is a real basis which meets the reason for raising pay. There is no reason for raising the pay of officers.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am confused, but I presume there are excellent reasons for the different proposals before us. Is it true that the amendment at the desk is the proposal the Senator from South Dakota has been authorized by the committee to recommend?

Mr. GURNEY. No. I am afraid the Senator was not in the Chamber when I explained that twice, and I shall be glad to explain it again.

The committee recommendation is shown in column 2 in the sheet before the Senator, indicating an increase of pay only for the enlisted men. After the committee approved that rate of pay on April 11, on April 19 the House passed a pay increase, as shown in column 6.

In the first place, I felt that the House increase was too much. They start with a private at \$75 a month. Our committee started a private at \$65, being a 30-percent increase. But the House also felt that officers, especially the junior-grade officers, were not receiving enough, and they increased their pay 20 percent.

Consequently, the amendment before the Senate now represents my personal ideas, worked out with the Army and Navy, and they now concur with me in offering this suggestion to the Senate.

Mr. MEAD. Therefore, if the Senator's original amendment, endorsed by the committee, were presented, and received the approval of the Senate, it would then

go to conference in conjunction with the measure which passed the House?

Mr. GURNEY. If my amendment shall be defeated, we will, of course, immediately return to the figures as shown in column 2, and then we will go into conference between the House and the Senate, with the House bill as shown in column 6, and the Senate bill as shown in column 2.

Mr. MEAD. Is the amendment the committee authorized shown in column 2?

Mr. GURNEY. I believe that the House figure, a total of \$632,000,000, is a little out of line, and not necessary, and we do have to watch the Treasury a little. In saying to the people of the United States, "We are offering a rate of pay for volunteers that is attractive," we recommend not only an initial rate of pay which provides for \$65 as a proper inducement to get men to stay in the Army and advance in grade, but absolutely increases their monthly wage rate.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. If, for instance, the Senate adopted the amendment approved by the committee, the total cost of which is \$275,000,000—is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is the total increase over present pay rates.

Mr. MEAD. Then the bill would go to conference, and the conferees would decide between the two increases, \$275,000,000 and \$632,000,000?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think probably we will begin with the Gurney basis. When the conferees start with the Gurney basis they will probably wind up in the stratosphere.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Aside from what may or may not be done in conference, it strikes me that we ought to do what seems to be wise here insofar as the Senate is concerned. I understand that the change in the proposed pay of officers, for one thing, was induced by the desire to keep the relative pay somewhat in harmony with what it has been heretofore. But aside from that, it is the hope, I suppose, of the Congress and of the Army and the Navy that inductees or enlistees will not be satisfied simply to serve for a year and a half, or whatever the period may be, at \$65, or some little increase up to \$70 or \$82 or \$90, but that they might have an inducement to remain in the Army and thereby work up to a position where they might occupy an important officer status, and that the increased pay is not so much for the present officers, although they may be entitled to it, as it is an inducement for a man to work his way up from the ranks into the higher categories.

Mr. GURNEY. It applies not only to the Army, but is an inducement for the young men of the United States to make the Army and the Navy a career.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and with the expectation that they will not always be satisfied to be privates.

Mr. GURNEY. And with the hope that they will not simply enlist for 18

months, but that they will enlist for 3 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the \$474,000,000 increase which is proposed now is about midway between the \$275,000,000 and the \$632,000,000 increase; the \$275,000,000 being as originally recommended in Senate bill 2057, and the \$632,000,000 being carried in House bill 6084, which has already passed the House.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; which has already passed the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that if we adopt the \$275,000,000 increase, and the matter went to conference, and the House bill provided a \$632,000,000 increase, we might arrive at somewhere near the \$474,000,000 increase that is now contained in the proposed amendment, as shown in column 5.

Mr. GURNEY. I agree that the Senator has made a fair statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. And that we might as well do it here in the Senate as wait to do it in conference.

Mr. GURNEY. That is my belief.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it not true that there has been no increase in officers' pay since 1922?

Mr. GURNEY. No; I do not believe that is quite correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Since 1942.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Since 1942? Has the increase in pay of junior officers and all up the line been of a permanent character?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. Prior to that time lieutenants were receiving \$1,500 a year.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the record show in about what length of time a man who enlists as a private may expect to become a captain or a first lieutenant or a second lieutenant?

Mr. GURNEY. During the war, the Senator knows—

Mr. OVERTON. I am speaking about the present time.

Mr. GURNEY. In peacetime there is the same opportunity to go to officers' candidate school as in wartime. It may, however, take the private quite a while to arrive at that point.

Mr. OVERTON. A statement about that was made in one of the hearings, but I have forgotten what it was. The Senator is correct; it will take a long, long time before a private can hope to be a captain. I do not think a captain's salary would be any inducement to enlistment as a private.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. But the higher grades of sergeant, such as technical sergeant or master sergeant, or chief petty officer or the higher grades in the Navy, are very attractive positions, because in addition to the salary the men receive rations and clothing and what not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A second lieutenant's pay under Senate bill 2057 is \$150, without any rations. A master sergeant's pay is \$140 under the provisions of the bill. Are there or are there not various inducements that go with the master sergeant's pay that would make it actually higher than the second lieutenant's pay?

Mr. GURNEY. There are, and I was coming to the point of putting the allowances in the RECORD and of explaining what the allowances are, such as rations, quarters, and what not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What we are very anxious to do at the present time, in addition to providing inducements for the privates and the corporals and the sergeants to remain in the Army is to make, particularly the Navy, a career for younger officers. Is that not true?

Mr. GURNEY. That is true, and I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. President, I believe we should have in the RECORD at this point a complete statement of the pay and allowances provided for enlisted men in addition to base pay. Of course base pay is shown in the schedule. I ask that a statement of pay and allowances provided for enlisted men in addition to base pay may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PAY AND ALLOWANCES PROVIDED FOR ENLISTED MEN IN ADDITION TO BASE PAY

##### I. PAY

(a) Longevity pay: 5 percent additional pay, computed on base pay for current grade, for each 3 years' prior service, up to a total of 50 percent additional pay.

(b) Overseas pay: 20 percent additional pay, computed on base pay (including flying pay, if received), for current grade, while serving outside the continental United States or in Alaska. (Provisions authorizing this additional pay were made permanent legislation by the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act.)

(c) Flying, parachute, and glider pay: Flying: 50 percent additional pay, computed on base pay for current grade, while on flying status.

Parachute: 50 percent additional pay, while rated as active parachutist.

Glider: 50 percent additional pay, computed on base pay for current grade not to exceed an increase of \$50 per month, while on glider status. (These additional-pay provisions are mutually exclusive.)

(d) Combat and expert infantryman pay: \$10 per month for combat infantryman and \$5 per month for expert infantryman, in addition to base pay, while entitled to wear the combat or the expert infantryman badge. (These provisions are temporary and expire 6 months after the end of the war.)

(e) Medical Corps men pay: \$10 per month additional pay, while entitled to wear the medical badge. (This legislation is temporary and expires 6 months after the end of the war.)

(f) Decoration pay: \$2 per month additional pay for holders of the Medal of Honor, DSC, DSM, DFC, or the Soldier's Medal.

##### II. ALLOWANCES

(a) Enlistment allowance: An amount computed at the rate of \$50 for each year of prior continuous service, provided such service did not terminate more than 90 days before reenlistment.

(b) Mustering-out pay: \$100 for enlisted men with less than 60 days' service; \$200 for

those with more than 60 days' service within the United States; or \$300 for those with more than 60 days' service, if service was performed outside of the United States. These amounts are payable upon discharge—\$100 at time of discharge and the balance, if any, in monthly installments.

(c) Allowance for quarters and dependents or family allowance for dependents:

(1) Persons in the first three grades may choose between:

(a) allowance for quarters for dependents (not to exceed \$5 per day); or

(b) family allowance for dependents: \$50 per month for wife, \$80 per month for wife and child, \$20 per month for each additional child, etc.

There is deducted from the pay of the soldier choosing family allowance for dependents not less than \$22 a month, the exact amount of such deduction varying with the type and number of dependents.

(2) Persons in grades below the first three grades receive only the family allowance for dependents above described. (Payments under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act may be made only for the duration plus 6 months.)

(d) Quarters and subsistence allowance: First three grades (master sergeants, technical sergeants, and staff sergeants), not furnished quarters and subsistence for themselves in kind, receive an allowance for quarters and subsistence not to exceed \$5 a day.

(e) Discharge travel allowance: On final separation from the service a soldier receives an allowance computed at the rate of 5 cents per mile between the place of discharge and the place where he entered the service.

(f) Furlough travel allowance: When granted a reenlistment furlough, a soldier receives an allowance in advance and computed at the rate of 5 cents per mile from place of reenlistment to soldier's home or other place designated by him, and return; excluding sea travel, which is provided in kind.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I also wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the latest estimate of what it cost the Government to keep an enlisted man in the Army. I have here a statement of over-all monthly cost to the Government of maintaining an average enlisted man in 1945. This does not include quarters such as would be provided for men in civilian life. Food, \$20. Clothes, \$20. Medical and dental care, \$3. Pay and allowances, average—includes base, longevity, foreign service, hazardous duty, family allowances—\$115.

Making a total of \$158 per month, without including quarters, and without taking any credit for whatever it may cost the Government to house the average soldier per month.

The average monthly take-home pay under present rates, not after this amendment or any other amendment is included in the bill—the average take-home pay per month is \$70 for enlisted men.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and myself, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota. The substitute will read as section 8 reads in the committee measure, except that on page 5, line 11, "\$100" is substituted for "\$94"; in line 12, "\$82" will be stricken and "\$90" will be inserted in lieu thereof; in the same line

"\$80" will be substituted for the "\$70"; and in line 13, "\$75" will be substituted for "\$65."

Then after line 15 of the bill we propose to insert:

(b) Section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1274; 34 U. S. C. 701), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. That the band of the United States Marine Corps shall consist of one leader whose pay and allowances shall be those of a captain in the Marine Corps; one second leader whose pay shall be \$220 per month and who shall have the allowances of a sergeant major; 10 principal musicians whose pay shall be \$180 per month; 25 first-class musicians whose pay shall be \$150 per month; 20 second-class musicians whose pay shall be \$120 per month; and 10 third-class musicians whose pay shall be \$102 per month; such musicians of the band to have the allowances of a sergeant: *Provided*, That the second leader and musicians of the band shall receive the same increases for length of service and the same enlistment allowance or gratuity for reenlisting as is now or may hereafter be provided for other enlisted men of the Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That the pay authorized herein shall apply in computing the pay of former members of the band now on the retired list and who have been retired since June 30, 1922: *Provided further*, That in the event of promotion of the second leader, or a musician of the band, to leader of the band, all service as such second leader, or as such musician of the band, or both, shall be counted in computing longevity increase in pay: *And provided further*, That hereafter during concert tours approved by the President, members of the Marine Band shall suffer no loss of allowances."

That is done to correct an injustice that was done in the pay bill for 1942, in which the United States Marine Corps was left out.

Mr. President, I want to correct one misstatement that was made in the colloquy a moment ago between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from South Dakota. The companion House bill to Senate bill 2057 contains no pay provision whatsoever. The pay provision in the House bill appears in another bill entirely, which is H. R. 6084.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, the reason why this situation now confronts the Senate from a parliamentary standpoint is that unless the House amends the Senate bill it will not be in conference. There is nothing going to conference as the result of the action which the Senate is now taking. In other words, the Senate proposes to send to the House the Senate bill, unless it is contemplated that the House bill will be taken up and all after the enacting clause stricken out and the bill we have now been working on substituted for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; that is contemplated. And the bill that will be used for that purpose will not be H. R. 6084; it will be H. R. 6064, which has no salary provision in it whatsoever.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And therefore there would be nothing in conference except the Senate action on this subject?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On the pay schedule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

I desire to say a few words about the amendment I have just offered. We are considering a bill which is designed to get more men into the Army through volunteer enlistments. Of course, the folks in the Pentagon Building seized upon this as a grand opportunity to increase the pay of officers. We have no difficulty in obtaining plenty of volunteer officers. We now have 250,000 of them. The Army says that on July 1, 1946, it will reduce the number to 150,000. It has 100,000 officers that it will have to dispense with between now and the 1st of July. It is a well-known fact that we can get twice as many, and probably three times as many, officers in the Army as we need.

Mr. WALSH. The same is true in the Navy. There are many more applicants for permanent commissions in the Navy than there are places available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for mentioning that fact. Of course, these pay proposals apply to the Army, the Navy, and all the other services in a uniform manner.

The committee reported a bill which provided for an increase in pay for enlisted men, but no increase in pay for officers. The amendment which has been perfected by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and myself followed that general design. We increased the pay of the last four grades in the enlisted service, and we left the officers entirely alone.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment which I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Colorado please send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I tried to follow the amendment as the Senator read it. As I understand, column 6 shows the House action on the pay question, which I again emphasize, under the contemplated parliamentary procedure, will not be in conference. The bill to which this amendment will be attached is the draft-extension bill, which does not contain any House action on pay. So the Senate must assume the responsibility, in this connection, of taking the only action that will be in conference on this question.

Let me ask the Senator from Colorado if he will explain for my benefit what the effect of the amendment is, taking column 6 as a guide.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Taking column 6 as a guide, for the seventh grade, that is, private in the Army or apprentice seaman in the Navy, under the perfected amendment which we have just offered the pay would be the same as in column 6, namely, \$75, or a 50-percent increase. For the sixth grade, private first class, or seaman second class in the Navy, the pay would be \$80, or a 48-percent increase. For the fifth grade, corporal in the Army or seaman first class in the Navy, the pay would be \$90. For the fourth grade, sergeant in the Army or class 1 petty officer in the Navy, the pay would be \$100. Other than that, the amendment is identical with column 2, or Senate bill 2057.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In other words, as I understand, the pending amendment would adopt the House schedule of pay as it passed the House in House bill 6084, down to the fourth grade. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And beyond that the Senator's amendment would have the effect of adopting the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in the grades above that. So the issue clearly presented in the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the amendment which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has offered on his behalf and mine, would be to increase the incentive for enlistments in the first four grades, and then to adopt the Senate Military Affairs Committee figures beyond those grades. So there is no proposal in our substitute for an increase in the pay of officer personnel.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator give me the total figure of increased cost?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would have to ask the Senator from Colorado. Can the Senator from Colorado, from his knowledge of this question, give us the difference between the total increase which would result from his modified amendment and the increase resulting from the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only information I can give is that the pay of officers—

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I can give him the figure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. As I understand, the Senator from Colorado does not include in his amendment an increase for officers. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator has the same figures in his amendment for enlisted men as the House has already adopted. So, deducting \$96,000,000 from column 6, the increase under the Senator's amendment would be \$536,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would not be quite that much. It would be considerably less than that. It would be about \$350,000,000.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator's figures are the same as those passed by the House, for enlisted men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that is not correct. They are not the same as those passed by the House—only for the seventh, sixth, fifth, and fourth grades.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am convinced that the increase would not be as much as has been stated, because the pending amendment does not follow the House action beyond the fourth grade.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The cost of the amendment which we have offered would be about \$350,000,000, as against \$474,000,000 in the case of the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, is the Senator reasonably confident of that figure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it is pretty much of an estimate, I will say to the Senator. I have not checked the figures, but I presume that they are approximately correct. I do not believe the increase could possibly be more than \$350,000,000. I think more than likely it would be \$325,000,000.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, looking at the amendment dated May 29, offered by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wisconsin, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if this is the amendment which is now pending?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not the pending amendment, because the Senator from Colorado and I have modified the amendment, so that we pick up from the House rates only the first four grades.

Mr. GURNEY. Can the Senator tell me what the figures would be for the third, second, and first grades?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They would follow the action of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GURNEY. I see. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the pending amendment picks up the rates in the House bill for the first four grades. Then it takes the rates in the Senate bill for the fifth grade and the sixth grade. In the Senate bill there is no increase in the seventh grade. The increase in the eighth grade in the pending amendment is the rate in the Senate bill. From there on, there are no increases. Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, the Senator has stated it in reverse.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The pending amendment adopts the House rates for the seventh, sixth, fifth, and fourth grades.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then, beginning with the third grade, the amendment does not change the Senate committee's recommendations. So we have a clear-cut issue here as between a substantial increase in the first four grades to stimulate voluntary enlistments, and the adoption of the Senate committee's recommendations for slight increases in the fourth, third, and second grades, and in the first grade, or the grade of master sergeant, with no increases beyond that point.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Am I correct in stating that the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Colorado gives the highest increase to the four lower grades of any amendment proposed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. So that it is the most generous one to those enlisting in the

lower ranks of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think we ought to face squarely the fact that unless we expect to continue indefinitely to utilize the draft as a means of maintaining our armed forces, and unless we are to continue—as it is proposed to do for 1 year in this bill—to rely indefinitely on the teen-agers for the main source of our manpower pool for the armed forces, we should take this step to raise the pay and make it somewhat commensurate with the service which we expect to be performed.

The able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] pointed out that one of the effects of the demobilization has been, for example, to take from the Air Corps ground forces the necessary skilled personnel to maintain our air forces in a position to keep their planes in order. Wherever we turn in a modern army we need men of skill and experience; and if they do not have it when they first enter the service, they should have an opportunity, as they do in the Navy, to obtain it and to make a career of the service. To me it is shocking to suggest that we must rely indefinitely upon the teen-agers as our main source of manpower. A country of the size of the United States, a country which has such an enormous capacity for the production of wealth, should be willing to make payments commensurate with the service which the men who go into the armed forces are expected to render.

I am convinced that if the Senate will go this far with this matter, we should be able to obtain the men we need. We shall relieve the drain on the teen-agers; and all the testimony of the military experts is to the effect that they prefer volunteers to draftees. So I believe this is a very important test, because, unless we take this step, as I pointed out earlier in the day, we shall be confronted with the same situation when another year rolls around.

With the reliance which every country must now place upon the continuation of education and the development of scientists and technicians, I assert that we should at least be willing to spend the amount of money necessary to reduce to the absolute minimum the drain upon the teen-agers and the interruption of their education. It is simply preposterous to say that we cannot afford an increase of \$350,000,000 annually for this purpose.

So, Mr. President, I certainly hope that this amendment will prevail and that we shall thus have a fair chance to test whether the volunteer system can furnish all the men needed for replacements and all the men needed to maintain an armed force which is adequate to protect the security of this Nation and to discharge its international responsibilities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do I correctly understand, then, that the amendment for which the Senator speaks, while costing, over all, less than the proposal submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], provides not only a greater incentive at the enlistment level,

but also the highest incentive which is being proposed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct. In other words, it would require a lesser amount of money than would be required by the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, but it would concentrate the money in the form of payments to men in the grades in which it is most essential to provide an inducement for voluntary enlistment on the part of men who have the training and experience needed to enable them to perform the difficult job of policing and overseas duty.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I desire to associate myself with the remarks he has just made in his able speech. I think the Senator will recall that many, many months ago when an army bill was under consideration the junior Senator from Oregon was the first Member of the Senate to propose that the pay of members of the armed forces be increased so as to provide sufficient inducement for a volunteer army as quickly as possible. At that time I made a proposal in the form of an amendment, which was voted down by the Senate, suggesting that a blanket increase be made in the pay of all personnel at that time, with the understanding, however, that it should be considered only as a tentative step pending the making of the type of investigation which I think is represented by the report set forth by the Military Affairs Committee and also by this Johnson-La Follette amendment.

I think it is of the utmost importance that we proceed to adopt this amendment to raise the pay of the enlisted personnel. It is necessary in fairness to the men in the Army whom we are asking to perform police service for us. They should receive pay which bears some relationship to the service they render. After all, the type of service required in the Army has become highly specialized and very much in the nature of police service, civil government service, and technical work. The taxpayers of the country should be willing to pay decent wages for the services rendered. Hence I am very happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin and I urge that this amendment which supports the Army pay principle which I urged many months ago be adopted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from Oregon.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to have the opinion of the able Senator from Wisconsin about a certain matter. Let us assume that we adopt the pending amendment which is offered as a substitute for the Gurney amendment, and thereby write into the bill the four top items in column 6 and the four next succeeding items in column 2, but no pay increases anywhere else.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the effect of the pending amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well.

Now let us assume that we pass the bill with that amendment in it, and thereupon substitute the entire bill for the substance of the House measure. The question is this: Would not all these items be in conference as a result of substituting our bill for the contents of the House bill?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is not my understanding that that would be the effect of the action which is contemplated, because, as I understand the situation, once the Senate bill is perfected, it is proposed to take the House measure extending the draft and strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the amended Senate bill. Since the House acted in a separate measure with regard to pay, namely, House bill 6084, that measure would not pass the Senate, and therefore it would not be in conference.

So the Senate would be adopting what would ultimately be the final action, except, of course, the House would be in a position, if it so desired, to offer as a compromise for the pay schedules in the first eight categories, pay schedules of a lesser amount than those adopted by the Senate. But there would be no possibility that anything in excess of what the Senate provided with regard to pay would come from conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming that the House refused to accept the Senate version of their bill when it came to them, that in effect would deny this amendment; would it not? So if the matter went to conference, the question in regard to this amendment would be whether to accept or reject this item. Is that the situation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No. The House conferees would be in a position, if they desired to do so, to urge the Senate conferees to accept a lesser rate of pay than had been incorporated in the bill by the action of the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I see.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the ceiling would be the Senate's action, because in the bill which went to conference with the House there would be nothing dealing with the pay of either noncommissioned or commissioned personnel, other than enlisted personnel.

Mr. AUSTIN. And whatever changes were proposed would have to be initiated by the House?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct. I feel quite certain that since we have adopted the House schedule in the first four categories, it would be very likely that they would be inclined to accept it, although, of course, I have no way of knowing that.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to remind the Senate of the ruling of Vice President Garner, when he was in the chair, when the Senate struck out everything in a House bill after the enacting clause. It was the ruling of the Vice President then in the chair, and the rul-

ing was afterwards reaffirmed, that the whole subject matter was then in conference, and that the conferees could write an entirely new bill.

In that event, there will be no ceiling in connection with the present matter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in the first place, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that, with all due respect to Vice President Garner, I have always questioned the broad scope of that ruling. I would agree with the Senator that if the Senate committee's action were to be attached to the bill dealing with pay schedules, which the House passed, that would be different. But that is not the case. We are simply proposing ultimately to strike out all after the enacting clause in the House measure extending the draft, and to insert the Senate bill. In the House measure, the House did not incorporate any amendments with regard to pay.

So it seemed to me that, under those circumstances, nothing except the first eight categories would be in conference.

I am not so familiar with the House rules but it would seem to me that in all probability that would be the result. I may be in error about it, but that is my best judgment.

Mr. OVERTON. It is my recollection that under the ruling of Vice President Garner—and it stands today; it never has been overruled—the whole matter would be in conference and that the conferees could write an entirely new bill. In that event, the conferees could increase the pay as much as they desired and as much as the two Houses would agree to do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I know that that ruling went a long way; but it would seem to me that in this particular instance the Senate ceilings would be likely to be the ultimate. However, I may be wrong about that.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope they will be the ultimate.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I wish to ask several questions. I may say that the Senator's amendment appeals to me very strongly. I believe that the basic reason for taking the proposed action to increase pay is to provide an incentive for enlistment, and that can best be done by providing increases in the first four grades. I say that because I realize that the men in the first four grades of enlisted men are the ones who will relieve the necessity of drafting the teen-age group.

Did the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Colorado give that matter careful thought? Would it not be wise to include all the enlisted grades and not leave out the fourth-grade sergeant, the third-grade staff sergeant, the technical sergeant, the chief petty officer, and the master sergeant?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I may say that if that were done we would run into the difficulties in the break between the top grade of the noncommissioned officer, and the first grade of the commissioned officer. In the Navy that

would apply, of course, to the warrant officer. Moreover, even with this hybrid amendment, dealing with the first four categories of the Johnson-La Follette amendment and the next four categories of the committee bill, we still leave a differential between each grade. It should also be borne in mind that as men rise in these grades their allowances and other considerations, as pointed out by the Senator from South Dakota, become a more important factor. So I believe, taking everything into consideration, that this amendment would provide a reasonably smooth pay schedule, advancing step by step.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I note that there is still a differential all the way along the line. I presume there are some other perquisites and considerations which go along with the upper enlisted grades but do not go with the first four grades on the list. Am I correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I believe that is true.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to propound to the Senator from Wisconsin another question which I think is very important. The House bill carried a total increase of \$632,000,000 a year, and we have been told that \$96,000,000 for officers will be deducted from that amount under the so-called Johnson-La Follette amendment. However, deducting that \$96,000,000 would not bring the figure down anywhere near \$325,000,000, the estimate of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The difference is to be accounted for by the fact that the estimate in the House schedule includes all the increases in the second and third grades. So it is necessary to deduct from the \$96,000,000 the difference between the cost of the Senate committee's recommendations concerning the second four categories of enlisted personnel and the House recommendations.

Mr. HAWKES. I realize that. But what I want to know is this: Is it the Senator's firm conviction that the total increase under the amendment he has offered will be not to exceed \$350,000,000 or \$375,000,000 at the most?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am relying principally on the Senator from Colorado for the estimate, and he said that in his judgment \$350,000,000 was the maximum.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am not quite through.

Mr. GURNEY. I think I can answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have had a hurried check made by the men who made up the schedule, and their best estimate, leaving out, as the Senator's amendment does, the increases for the warrant officers as well as other officers, is that the total cost will be \$425,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator referred to leaving out the increases for the warrant officers. However, we have also adopted the Senate committee's recommendation with regard to the third grade; the second grade,

first-class petty officer and chief petty officer; and first grade, master sergeant and chief petty officer.

Mr. GURNEY. My answer would be based on the assumption that the Senator's amendment would raise wages only for enlisted men.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We cannot wave aside the savings under the pending amendment which result from adopting the Senate committee's last four categories.

Mr. GURNEY. We have taken into consideration \$106 for the third grade; \$118 for the second grade, \$126 for the chief petty officer, and \$140 for the first grade. The best estimates which have been hurriedly made, indicate that the greater number of men are in the seventh grade at \$75 and the total cost under the Senator's amendment would be \$425,000,000. That is the best information which I have been able to obtain.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to receive those figures, if they are accurate, and I point out that they are still substantially under the figures of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for yielding to me, and I thank the Senator from South Dakota for giving us the information which he just furnished. I am inclined to believe that we will find the figures of the Senator from South Dakota more nearly correct.

I wish to propound the following question to the Senator from Wisconsin: Does he believe, after giving this matter long and serious thought, that it is likely to render unnecessary the drafting into the service of teen-age men?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I can only say that I believe this amendment is sufficiently substantial in its provision for an increase in pay in the first four categories to have the effect of tremendously reducing the drain on the teen-age manpower quota. No man can say whether it will go far enough to prevent any drafting of teen-agers. But it is my firm conviction that if the Army will take this proposed pay schedule and really put on a campaign to obtain enlistments for the foreign service they will come very close to relieving the teen-age manpower pool of any drain whatever.

Mr. HAWKES. I believe that to be a fact, and that is why I like the amendment. I think it is worth considerable to this country to avoid in every possible way the drafting of teen-age men.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree with the Senator. The greatest part of the cost under this amendment would go into those categories which will make it possible to obtain the maximum number of men through voluntary enlistments.

Mr. HAWKES. That is why I like the amendment in its present form of making enlistments attractive where it will relieve to the maximum the pressure for teen-agers.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I am in thorough accord with the amendment of the Senator

from Wisconsin, and I associate myself with his views. The sooner we can have a completely volunteer army, the better off the country will be. We need an intelligent volunteer army, and we need men who will remain in the service and carry into their work their early training. Thereby we would have a much better army than would be obtained by taking into the service boys of 18 years of age and then letting them out of the service at the end of 18 months of service. It is in the lowest grades that we want enlistments.

I shall not object later on to increasing the pay of officers, but at this moment the record will show that it is the higher ranking officers who are not leaving the service. It is the enlisted men who are needed very badly. When the time arrives I shall be glad to vote to increase the pay of officers. But at the present time my concern is to obtain the volunteer enlistment of men in the lowest grades, and it is in those grades that I think the greatest increases in compensation should be made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to speak briefly about the amendment. If the Senate desires that the country shall have a volunteer army, and is sincere in that desire, we should agree to the amendment. I believe it will solve the problem of obtaining a volunteer army. My mail clearly indicates that many of the officers desire to remain in the service. We have a surplus of officers, but not of men. I have some trouble in voting to take under the draft 18- and 19-year-old boys. But I have felt that if we should adopt an amendment such as the one now pending, we would eliminate one of our difficulties. Under the emergency of today it is our duty to endeavor to obtain a volunteer army in order to solve the problem of the proper defense of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Suppose we have an army of 1,000,000 enlisted men. If we could give each one of those men a monthly increase of \$25, that would be \$300 a year for each man. With 1,000,000 men, the yearly cost would be \$300,000,000. Therefore I think the estimate of the Senator from South Dakota is not correct. We increase the pay of the enlisted personnel only in the seventh grade, to the extent of \$25 a month. In the next three grades the increase is less than \$25 a month, and in the last three grades, there is no increase whatever.

So it would seem to me that the estimate which was made a while ago, that the outside cost of this proposal submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin and me would be \$350,000,000, is a very generous and conservative estimate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I would also like to say that the estimates which have been furnished to the Senator from South Dakota in any event are less than those for the proposal which he made, and under this amendment the increased cost is concentrated in the

categories where we need the men if we are to save the teen-agers as much as we possibly can from having their education interrupted and from being sent abroad to do police duty, which the Army feels, as I think all the testimony in the record shows, are not so well qualified to discharge as men who are older and have better judgment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not informed at all concerning many of the questions involved in the compensation matter. The amendment refers to base pay. Will the Senator indicate about what a master sergeant gets in addition to the \$140?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from South Dakota had a mimeographed statement which he put into the RECORD a little while ago. I do not have it before me, but I know it includes quarters allowances and clothing allowances under certain circumstances. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota on that point.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to answer the Senator as well as I can.

The first three grades of sergeants have allowances for quarters.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does that mean? Does that mean for his family, or just for himself?

Mr. GURNEY. The statement I have says:

1. Persons in the first three grades may choose between—

(a) Allowance for quarters for dependents (not to exceed \$5 per day); or

(b) Family allowance for dependents; \$50 per month for wife; \$80 per month for wife and child; \$20 per month for each additional child; etc.

There is deducted from the pay of the soldier choosing family allowance for dependents not less than \$22 a month, the exact amount of such deduction varying with the type and number of dependents.

2. Persons in grades below the first three grades receive only the family allowance for dependents above described.

In addition to that—

First three grades (master sergeants, technical sergeants, and staff sergeants), not furnished quarter and subsistence for themselves in kind, receive an allowance for quarters and subsistence not to exceed \$5 a day.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One hundred and fifty dollars a month?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would that be in addition to the \$140?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In addition to that, does he also get the benefits we have given to other soldiers, in the way of insurance, and other things of that sort? Has that been calculated in estimating what it is worth per month?

Mr. GURNEY. So far as I know, he receives the same allowances all enlisted men receive. All enlisted men have life insurance, hospital benefits, such things like that. Those in the first three grades receive allowances for quarters and subsistence for dependents.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would it be fair to say that all those things together would amount, roughly, to \$300 a month—the allowances, the base pay, and the insurance? Would that be an

approximate figure, in the Senator's opinion?

Mr. GURNEY. I would rather not make a firm answer on that, but it would seem so, with the \$5 a day maximum. Of course, that is the maximum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In addition, there is the value, for example, of insurance, a \$10,000 insurance policy at the reduced rates, and the ability to purchase things at the PX, and all that. I am merely making a rough estimate as to how attractive life in the Army is, and I was wondering whether the Senator thinks \$300 a month is a fair estimate.

Mr. GURNEY. I do not believe I can give an answer, but I do say that all enlisted men and officers have a right to buy at the PX or the commissary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I am trying to get at is whether enlistment in the Army would be attractive to the average fellow who works on the farm or in business.

Mr. GURNEY. I believe that even at the rates of pay which are now received, the men in the top three grades have a very fine, attractive proposition, because their pay increases 5 percent each 3 years when they reenlist.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know why the Senator is reluctant to commit himself on that detail, but someone from the committee, or the clerk, should have an estimate or average of what it is worth.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sorry I cannot give the Senator the average. If there is any member of the committee who can give a statement on that point, I should be glad to have him do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and his colleague, the Senator from Colorado. I think the amendment they have proposed is constructive. Frankly, as one who has had some experience in occupation duties, I do not see why we should expect men doing that kind of police work not to have reasonable compensation for doing it, and I do not think the pay schedule which the Senators have proposed is by any means too high for that type of work. I feel that it will encourage enlistments. If it does not encourage enlistments, through the action of the Senate which I supported today, we still have the pool going down to the 18-year-old men, but the amendment, if agreed to, may furnish a pay schedule sufficiently attractive to get a volunteer Army, which I think the Committee on Military Affairs would think more desirable, if it could be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to see if I understand what it is we are to vote on. If I understand, the Senator's amendment starts in at \$75 and goes up to \$80, \$90, and \$100.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then it drops back, after that, to the original figure in column 3, in the table we have been furnished.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Column 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. Column 3 is the same. Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Column 2 is the committee bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the original Gurney amendment—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We are not considering the original Gurney amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know, but it is the same figure—\$106 and \$140. So that the amendment reduces the staff sergeant and second class petty officer from \$115 to \$106, and the technical sergeant and first class petty officer from \$135 to \$118, the chief petty officer from \$150 to \$126, and the master sergeant from \$165 to \$140.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We are not reducing them from what they are getting now.

Mr. BARKLEY. But they are being reduced as compared with the pending Gurney amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Beyond that, no increase at all is provided.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No. We add the first four categories, from \$75 to \$100, to the Senate Military Affairs Committee proposal, and then accept their recommendations in all other categories.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that mean that the officers beyond warrant officers, as proposed either in the committee bill or in the Gurney amendment, get an increase, or do they not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Beyond warrant officers, there are no increases in the pending substitute for the Gurney amendment. I wish to say to the Senator that I agree with the statement made by the Senator from Illinois, there may come a time when we will have to increase the pay of enlisted men in the higher grades, and officers, but at the moment our problem is to make as good an effort as we can make to get volunteers in the service instead of draftees, because we know the draft is going to fall heaviest upon the teen-age group, if it has to be exercised. At the moment I do not know about other Senators, but my correspondence is filled with mail from officers who are complaining because they are being eliminated from the Army, and at this moment it does not seem to me to be urgent to consider that, although I do not wish to be placed in the position of being unsympathetic with any showing which may be made subsequently.

In connection with the bill, which is largely for the purpose of extending the draft, it seems to me we are justified in taking this amount of money and putting it into the categories where we have the most hope, if the Army will enthusiastically carry on a campaign, that we may get the necessary forces as a result of volunteers, instead of drafting the teen-agers.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I think, perhaps, I should say a few more words. I do not believe we are treating the sergeants, the career men of the Army, fairly. The top three grades are the men who make the Army, and comparable

grades in the Navy are the men who make the Navy.

I am definitely in favor of giving a small increase to all officers. That is my personal feeling, and not a committee recommendation, and I do not want in any way to leave the impression that it is a committee recommendation. But the sergeants in the Army, and comparable officers in the Navy, are actually the backbone of the armed forces. We must have career men in the forces, and if we should adopt the substitute, we would not be making proper spacing between the several grades in the enlisted categories for the responsibility each of the men in these groups has thrown on his shoulders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the sergeants for whom he speaks—and for whom I have much consideration, too—in foreign service get 20 percent increase in their pay over the base pay, plus the longevity pay?

Mr. GURNEY. That is entirely correct, and the private gets 20 percent increase for overseas duty.

Mr. President, it is my belief that we should take care of all enlisted men in direct ratio to the responsibility placed upon them. Everything is thrown out of gear when we do otherwise. There must be an incentive each time for a man to try to advance from private to corporal, and then to sergeant, and on up. Unless there is the proper spacing the high morale in the Army is not high.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask the honorable Senator from South Dakota whether the Committee on Military Affairs in considering the pay of generals and admirals and the higher officers of the Army and the Navy gave any consideration to the flight pay?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes, the committee did. Nothing was done in committee respecting changing the pay of the officers; so the question of flight pay did not come up.

Mr. OVERTON. Why did it not come up? I think the whole thing originated in an effort on the part of some of us on the Appropriations Committee to reduce the flight pay of the admirals and the generals. We had some controversy about it, and finally the Committee on Appropriations requested that the Army and the Navy submit a program, and the program they submitted was that all flight pay be retained.

Mr. GURNEY. The program, as I understand it, was that the percentage for extrahazardous flight and submarine tours of duty and what not should remain just as it is now, and that all officers and enlisted men receive a flat increase of 20 percent.

Mr. OVERTON. Exactly.

Mr. GURNEY. I should be glad to have the Senator from Louisiana direct a question on that phase of the matter to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator from South Dakota has stated the proposition correctly.

Mr. OVERTON. The Committee on Appropriations was advised that this was a matter upon which the Committee on Appropriations should not act, but that one of the standing legislative committees should consider it. We had the matter up in connection with the rescission bill, and I thought that was a good opportunity to act upon it, because the rescission bill related both to the War Department and the Navy Department. But the conclusion was reached, I think by a majority of 9 to 8 on the part of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that a request should be made of the War Department and the Navy Department to make a study of the whole subject matter and make a recommendation by a certain time, I think it was as of January of this year.

Mr. GURNEY. They did make the recommendation. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, and the Military Affairs Committee appointed a subcommittee to consider the matter. I understand the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] wants to make a statement on flight pay and other extrahazardous pay. If he were on the floor I am sure he would be answering the Senator at this moment as to the reason for not taking any action in the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OVERTON. I merely wanted to know whether the Military Affairs Committee made any inquiry into the subject matter of flight pay, and whether they ascertained, for instance, what I think was rather conclusively shown before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that a number of generals and admirals, many of whom sit in swivel chairs in offices, get flight pay of \$4,000 a year extra by taking a 4-hour flight during a whole month. The privilege is very much abused, and I was hopeful that the Military Affairs Committee had made diligent inquiry into the whole subject matter. I should like to know if the committee did so. May I ask the chairman if the committee made such an inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In connection with the unification bill a study is made of such matters both on the part of the Army and the Navy, and if that bill ever becomes law these things would be reported back to us. The differential between the flight pay and other pay will undoubtedly be changed as time goes on. Flight was not contemplated in the beginning; it was quite unusual but it is becoming more commonplace all the time. Adjustments will have to be made in the light of the circumstances of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to know when an adjustment will be made. The matter has been brought up before the Appropriations Committee for some 4 or 5 years without the slightest success. Each time we have been told it is a matter for the Military Affairs Committee to handle and for the Naval Affairs Committee to handle. Yet there has never been any adjustment of the flight pay.

The other day I read in the New York Times an article which stated that four

officers of the War Department were killed in a flight by reason of their plane coming in contact with a building in Newark, N. J. I think there were five or six officers in the plane. They were on that flight, in the language of the reporter of the New York Times, curiously enough, in order to get their additional flight pay which is 50 percent over and above their salaries.

I want to know when this huge 50-percent increase in the salaries of many admirals and generals and other high officers is going to be adjusted by either the Naval Affairs Committee or the Military Affairs Committee. I was told that this matter would be brought up in this bill and would be handled in this bill. But I see no action taken by the Military Affairs Committee, and I doubt if any very serious inquiry was made into the matter.

Mr. GURNEY. Of course this bill is only a bill to extend selective service, and the reason the pay schedule came into it was because we wanted the country to know that both the Senate and the House were really trying to put an incentive into the bill for volunteers so we would not have to draft so many boys. Consequently we did not go into the extrahazardous duties of either the Army or the Navy. Personally I am trying only to present the bill on selective service, so I am not prepared to answer the Senator with respect to flight pay.

Mr. OVERTON. The able Senator stated that before he offered his amendment he had consulted with the War Department and the Navy Department. I am quite sure that he consulted with the generals and the admirals, and not with subordinates, with privates and sergeants and the officers of very inferior rank. Am I correct in that surmise?

Mr. GURNEY. The armed forces made a recommendation of 20-percent increase straight through for all officers and all enlisted men. We have now changed the recommendations, not only in my amendment, but in the amendment which is now being offered as a substitute, so that they do not conform at all with what was recommended by the armed forces.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for the remarks he has just made in connection with his amendment, and his excellent suggestions made to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. We have threshed that matter out in the Appropriations Committee, and we will probably discuss it again.

The parliamentary situation being what it is, I wonder if the Senator from South Dakota would have objection to my asking unanimous consent to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays upon the Gurney amendment, because the amendment now pending before the Senate is a substitute for the Gurney amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. I will answer the Senator by saying that I believe the yeas and nays have already been ordered on the pending substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]

and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. So as soon as I conclude my statement, and I shall be through in 30 seconds or so, if the Senate will allow me to proceed, then a vote will be taken on the substitute. The Senator's request to withdraw his request for the yeas and nays on my amendment would be in full force and effect provided the substitute amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; but I ask the Senator at this time, in view of the parliamentary situation, if he would have any objection to my withdrawing my request for the yeas and nays, after the vote is had on the substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to have the Senator do whatever he wishes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays on the Gurney amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Why not have a yeas-and-nays vote on it?

Mr. MAYBANK. Because my judgment is that the first yeas-and-nays vote, being the vote on the Johnson-La Follette substitute, will settle the question. Why have two votes? We will have a yeas-and-nays vote now on the substitute.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator ask to withdraw his request for the yeas and nays on the substitute?

Mr. MAYBANK. No, no; I ask to withdraw my request for the yeas on the original amendment; that is, on the Gurney amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say that I do not understand the request, and I ask that it be stated.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from South Carolina is asking for unanimous consent to withdraw the request made by him for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Upon the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota or the substitute for it which is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the request of the Senator from South Carolina is to withdraw his request for the yeas and nays on the Gurney amendment only; not on the substitute amendment. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none, and the order for the yeas and nays on the Gurney amendment is vacated.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I do not want the Senate to vote under misinformation or what I believe is misinformation. The substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wisconsin has been thrown at us without our having time actually to figure out what it would cost in the way of an increase in appropriations in the next fiscal year. A little while ago, in debate with the Senator from Colorado, I made the statement that I figured that the increase would be \$425,000,000. Since then a finance officer has telephoned me

that the Johnson-La Follette amendment would cost between \$450,000,000 and \$465,000,000, making the figures approximately the same as those shown in column 5, or my amendment. So I base my objection to the substitute on the fact that it does not make the proper spacing and does not give enough credit to the master sergeants who train the men in the lower grades as they come into the Army.

I hope that the substitute will not be adopted for another reason, and that is that I do not believe we should increase the initial pay of anyone coming into the Army more than 30 percent. The substitute would increase the pay 50 percent. That is quite a jump to take. There is no termination date when the increased pay will end. Of course, there is no termination date in the committee bill; but I feel that a 30-percent increase is a fine incentive, and that it will be sufficiently attractive so that we will get all the men we would get even though we were to raise the pay to a higher figure than is proposed in the substitute.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the amendment of the able Senator the one dated April 19, with several sections in it?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It includes an increase in the pay of members of the United States Marine Band.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator would leave out the provision for increase in the pay of members of the band and band leaders, making it retroactive to June 30, 1922, would not the cost be a great deal less? Naturally it would.

Mr. GURNEY. What would cost less?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The whole cost of the increase would be less if we were to deal only with the enlisted personnel and leave out the part about retroactive pay for band leaders and other officers.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. They are left out of the substitute.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand the substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wisconsin, it deals only with the seventh, sixth, and fifth grades, and has nothing to say about retroactive pay for band leaders.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I hope the substitute will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the nature of a substitute for the modified amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, after line 3, to strike out section 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 8. The first paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, \$140; enlisted men of the second grade, \$118; enlisted men of the third grade, \$106; enlisted men of the fourth grade, \$100; enlisted men of the fifth grade, \$90; enlisted men of the sixth grade, \$80; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, \$75. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of \$132."

"Section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1274; 34 U. S. C. 701), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. That the band of the United States Marine Corps shall consist of one leader whose pay and allowances shall be those of a captain in the Marine Corps; one second leader whose pay shall be \$220 per month and who shall have the allowances of a sergeant major; 10 principal musicians whose pay shall be \$180 per month; 25 first-class musicians whose pay shall be \$150 per month; 20 second-class musicians whose pay shall be \$120 per month; and 10 third-class musicians whose pay shall be \$102 per month; such musicians of the band to have the allowances of a sergeant: *Provided*, That the second leader and musicians of the band shall receive the same increases for length of service and the same enlistment allowance or gratuity for reenlisting as is now or may hereafter be provided for other enlisted men of the Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That the pay authorized herein shall apply in computing the pay of former members of the band now on the retired list and who have been retired since June 30, 1922: *Provided further*, That in the event of promotion of the second leader, or a musician of the band, to leader of the band, all service as such second leader, or as such musician of the band, or both, shall be counted in computing longevity increase in pay: *And provided further*, That hereafter during concert tours approved by the President, members of the Marine Band shall suffer no loss of allowances."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is unavoidably absent, and who, if present and voting, would vote as I am about to vote. Being free to vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is unavoidably detained. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS]. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is unavoidably detained. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who, if present and voting, would vote as I intend to vote. Being, therefore, free to vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is unavoidably detained by reason of his participation in a radio broadcast in the Senate Radio Gallery on the subject of the national health program.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. That pair and its transfer have heretofore been announced.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is unavoidably detained. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. That pair and its transfer have heretofore been announced.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 4, as follows:

## YEAS—67

Aiken	Hill	O'Daniel
Austin	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Huffman	Overton
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Buck	Kilgore	Robertson
Burch	Knowland	Russell
Butler	La Follette	Saltonstall
Byrd	Langer	Shipstead
Capehart	Lucas	Smith
Capper	McCarran	Stewart
Connally	McClellan	Tunnell
Cordon	McFarland	Tydings
Donnell	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Walsh
Ferguson	Maybank	Wheeler
Fulbright	Mead	Wherry
George	Millikin	White
Green	Mitchell	Wiley
Hawkes	Moore	Wilson
Hayden	Morse	
Hickenlooper	Murdoch	

## NAYS—4

Ball	Hart	Thomas, Utah
Gurney		

## NOT VOTING—25

Andrews	Brewster	Chavez
Bailey	Bridges	Downey
Bankhead	Bushfield	Gerry
Bilbo	Carville	Gossett

Guffey	Reed	Tobey
Hatch	Stanfill	Willis
Murray	Taft	Young
Myers	Taylor	
Pepper	Thomas, Okla.	

So the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the nature of a substitute for the modified amendment offered by Mr. GURNEY was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Hereafter the retired or retirement pay of any person whose name is borne on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States and who is entitled to receive retired or retirement pay shall, in lieu of being computed upon the basis of the pay to which he was entitled at the time of his discharge from his commissioned service, be computed upon the basis of the rate provided in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended by this act, for an officer of corresponding grade who is credited with the same number of years of service for longevity purposes as the number with which such person is credited.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this is a committee amendment. The committee unanimously adopted the amendment and requested me to present it to the Senate. It is a very simple matter of adjusting a discrimination between the pay of retired emergency officers of the First World War and the pay of retired emergency officers of the Second World War. The officers of the Second World War are retired on the basis of the 1942 pay table. The officers of the First World War are retired on the basis of the 1922 pay table. The facts are simply as follows:

Retirement pay for disabled emergency officers of World War I was provided for by Public Law No. 506, Seventieth Congress. Under this law an emergency officer shown to be 30 percent permanently disabled as a result of a disease or injury resulting directly from war service was placed on the retired list.

The Economy Act of 1933 resulted in removal from the rolls practically all of officers other than those whose disabilities were incurred in combat. Some were restored by subsequent legislation.

The number now receiving emergency officers' retirement pay because of disability incurred in line of duty during World War I service is under 2,500 and most of these are combat cases.

Ninety-two percent, or more than 2,300 now on the rolls, are junior officers—second lieutenants, first lieutenants, and captains.

The average age of retired emergency officers of World War I is 59.

The proposed increases for this group would cost approximately \$650,000 for the first year. This amount will rapidly de-

crease because of the high death rate of this group.

I have another statement relating to this matter, and I think it clarifies it further: On July 30, 1945, there were 2,550 emergency officers on the retired list created by Public Law No. 506, Seventieth Congress. The records of the Veterans' Administration show officers in the various grades or ranks as follows:

Colonels	6
Lieutenant colonels and commanders	27
Majors and lieutenant commanders	155
Captains and lieutenants (senior grade)	640
First lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade)	991
Second lieutenants and ensigns	731

The average age of these officers is now 59, and the average monthly rate of pay June 30, 1945, was \$137.28.

Records of the Veterans' Administration show that on February 28, 1946, the number entitled to retirement pay had been reduced to 2,505 by deaths. Of those now on the retired list only 2,453 were actually receiving retirement pay February 28, 1946.

The average monthly pay of World War I AUS officers retired because of disability is \$163.75 as compared with the average of \$137.28 for World War I emergency officers.

There is the story in a nutshell. The discrimination between the identical type of officers in the two world wars is as follows: \$163.75 is paid to such officers who served in the Second World War, and \$137.28 is paid to such officers who served in the First World War.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The amendment provides, in substance, for the doing of simple justice as between veterans of the two wars; is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is. I thank the Senator from Oregon. The amendment provides the nearest to justice that we can do at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, did the Senator indicate the amount it probably would cost to bring about such an equalization?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I stated it exactly. It would be \$650,000 for the first year, and it is expected that that amount will rapidly decrease because of the high death rate of the officers in that group.

Mr. President, I shall take only a moment further. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of a letter written to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. It bears on this subject.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1946.

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS,  
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The purpose of this letter is to request an amendment to the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to place all officers receiving retirement pay on an equal footing.

Section 1, Public Law No. 506, Seventieth Congress, which provides for retirement benefits for emergency officers disabled in line of duty in active service during World War I, reads in part as follows:

"That all persons who have served as officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the World War, other than as officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who during such service have incurred physical disability in line of duty, and who have been, or may hereafter, within 1 year, be rated in accordance with law at not less than 30 percent permanent disability by the United States Veterans' Bureau for disability resulting directly from such war service, shall, from date of receipt of application by the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, be placed upon, and thereafter continued on, separate retired lists hereby created as part of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, to be known as the emergency officers' retired list of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, respectively, with the rank held by them when discharged from their commissioned service, and shall be entitled to the same privileges as are now or may hereafter be provided for by law or regulations for officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who have been retired for physical disability incurred in line of duty, and shall be entitled to all hospitalization privileges and medical treatment as are now or may hereafter be authorized by the United States Veterans' Bureau, and

shall receive from date of receipt of their application retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the pay to which they were entitled at the time of their discharge from their commissioned service, except pay under the act of May 16, 1920."

The purpose of this law was to place emergency officers who were disabled in line of duty in active war service on an equality with retired officers of the regular services. The language underscored in the above quotation was used because the laws pertaining to officers of the regular services in effect at that time provided that retirement pay should be at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay.

As already pointed out it was the intent of Congress to place disabled officers of the emergency forces on an equal pay status with officers of the regular service when disabled in line of duty. It was also intended that any subsequent legislative enactments decreasing or increasing retirement pay of Regular officers should be applicable to emergency officers. It was not intended that the pay authorized by Public Law No. 506, Seventieth Congress, should be stationary.

In this connection attention is called to section 106, Public Law No. 212, Seventy-second Congress, and section 1, title II, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, reducing the retired pay of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, etc. Emergency officers' retirement pay was reduced under these laws to the same extent as that of the Regular officers. Such reduction was based on the

theory that Congress intended that all officers should be on a complete parity with respect to pay. The propriety of the reduction of emergency officers' retirement pay was never questioned notwithstanding that the law under which these officers are paid states that they shall receive retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the pay to which they were entitled at the time of their discharge from commissioned service.

However, when the pay of officers in the first pay period was increased by the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, emergency officers receiving retirement pay under the provisions of Public Law No. 506, Seventieth Congress, were held not to be eligible for this increase. This ruling was in direct conflict with the position taken when emergency officers' retirement pay was reduced under the 1932 and 1933 laws and was based on a belief that the rate of pay for these officers was fixed by law and could not be changed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Next I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the retirement pay tables which are included in the books I now submit. I should like to have them copied into the RECORD. They show the retirement pay under the 1922 statute and the retirement pay under the 1942 statute.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pay of retired officers

PAY OF OFFICERS RETIRED ON AND AFTER JULY 1, 1922 (ACT JUNE 10, 1922)

Grade	Pay pe- riod	Annual base pay	Monthly rates										
			Initial monthly pay un- der con- ditions stated	Over 3 years' service	Over 6 years' service	Over 9 years' service	Over 12 years' service	Over 15 years' service	Over 18 years' service	Over 21 years' service	Over 24 years' service	Over 27 years' service	Over 30 years' service
General of the Armies of the United States.....		\$13,500.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00
Lieutenant general *.....		8,250.00	687.50	687.50	687.50	687.50	687.50	687.50	687.50	687.50	687.50	687.50	687.50
Major general.....		6,000.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00
Brigadier general.....		4,500.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00
Colonel:													
Over 26 years' service.....	6	3,000.00	350.00									362.50	375.00
First appointment above captain.....	6	3,000.00	250.00	262.50	275.00	287.50	300.00	312.50	325.00	337.50	350.00	362.50	375.00
Appointed under sec. 24, act June 4, 1920.....	6	3,000.00	250.00	262.50	275.00	287.50	300.00	312.50	325.00	337.50	350.00	362.50	375.00
Less than 26 years' service.....	5	2,625.00	218.75	229.69	240.62	251.56	262.50	273.43	284.37	295.31	306.25		
Lieutenant colonel:													
Over 30 years' service.....	6	3,000.00	359.37										359.37
Over 20, less than 30 years.....	5	2,625.00	284.37							295.31	306.25	317.19	
First appointment above captain.....	5	2,625.00	218.75	229.69	240.62	251.56	262.50	273.43	284.37	295.31	306.25	317.19	
Appointed under sec. 24, act June 4, 1920.....	5	2,625.00	218.75	229.69	240.62	251.56	262.50	273.43	284.37	295.31	306.25	317.19	
Less than 20 years' service.....	4	2,250.00	187.50	196.87	206.25	215.62	225.00	234.37	243.75				
Major:													
Over 23 years' service.....	5	2,625.00	295.31								306.25	317.19	328.12
Over 14, less than 23 years.....	4	2,250.00	225.00					234.37	243.75	253.12			
First appointment above second lieutenant.....	4	2,250.00	187.50	196.87	206.25	215.62	225.00	234.37	243.75	253.12			
Appointed to Regular Army to fill vacancies created by increase of commissioned personnel thereof in 1920. (act May 23, 1928.).....	4	2,250.00	187.50	196.87	206.25	215.62	225.00	234.37	243.75	253.12			
Less than 14 years' service.....	3	1,800.00	150.00	157.50	165.00	172.50	180.00						
Captain:													
Over 17 years' service.....	4	2,250.00	234.37						243.75	253.12	262.50	271.87	281.25
Over 7, less than 17 years.....	3	1,800.00	165.00			172.50	180.00	187.50	195.00	202.50	210.00	217.50	225.00
First appointment above second lieutenant.....	3	1,800.00	150.00	157.50	165.00	172.50	180.00	187.50					
Present rank July 1, 1920, or earlier.....	3	1,800.00	150.00	157.50	165.00	172.50	180.00	187.50					
Less than 7 years' service.....	2	1,500.00	125.00	131.25	137.50								
First lieutenant:													
Over 10 years' service.....	3	1,800.00	172.50				180.00	187.50	195.00	202.50	210.00	217.50	225.00
Over 3, less than 10 years.....	2	1,500.00	131.25	131.25	137.50	143.75							
First appointment above second lieutenant.....	2	1,500.00	125.00	131.25	137.50	143.75							
Less than 3 years' service.....	1	1,125.00	93.75										
Second lieutenant:													
Over 5 years' service.....	2	1,500.00	131.25		137.50	143.75	150.00	156.25	162.50	168.75	175.00	181.25	187.50
Less than 5 years' service.....	1	1,125.00	93.75	98.44									

\*Entitled also to commutation of quarters, heat, and light, \$8,000. See 4 Comp. Gen. 317; prescribed by the President pursuant to act Sept. 3, 1919 (41 Stat. 283; 10 U. S. C. 671a; M. L., 1929, sec. 1372).

\*R. S. 1261. (See Dec. Comp. Gen. A-28422 dated Sept. 16, 1929.)

Pay of retired officers, effective June 1, 1942, under act June 16, 1942

Grade	Pay period	Annual base pay	Monthly rates										
			Initial monthly pay under conditions stated	Over 3 years' service	Over 6 years' service	Over 9 years' service	Over 12 years' service	Over 15 years' service	Over 18 years' service	Over 21 years' service	Over 24 years' service	Over 27 years' service	Over 30 years' service
General of the Armies of the United States		\$13,500.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00	\$1,125.00
General of the Army		6,000.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00
Lieutenant general		6,000.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00
Major general		6,000.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00
Brigadier general		4,500.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00	375.00
Colonel	6	3,000.00	250.00	262.50	275.00	287.50	300.00	312.50	325.00	337.50	350.00	362.50	375.00
Lieutenant colonel:													
Over 30 years' service	6	3,000.00	375.00										375.00
Less than 30 years' service	5	2,625.00	218.75	229.69	240.62	251.56	262.50	273.43	284.37	295.31	306.25	317.19	
Major:													
Over 23 years' service	5	2,625.00	295.31								306.25	317.19	328.12
Less than 23 years' service	4	2,250.00	187.50	196.87	206.25	215.62	225.00	234.37	243.75	253.12			
Captain:													
Over 17 years' service	4	2,250.00	234.37						243.75	253.12	262.50	271.87	281.25
Less than 17 years' service	3	1,800.00	150.00	157.50	165.00	172.50	180.00	187.50					
First lieutenant:													
Over 10 years' service	3	1,800.00	172.50						195.00	202.50	210.00	217.50	225.00
Less than 10 years' service	2	1,500.00	125.00	131.25	137.50	143.75	150.00	156.25	162.50	168.75	175.00	181.25	187.50
Second lieutenant:													
Over 5 years' service	2	1,500.00	131.25		137.50	143.75	150.00	156.25	162.50	168.75	175.00	181.25	187.50
Less than 5 years' service	1	1,350.00	112.50	118.12									

<sup>1</sup> Entitled also to commutations of quarters, heat, and light, \$8,000. (See 4 Comp. Gen. 317.)

## NOTES

1. No increase for longevity for periods not on active duty after retirement unless retired for wounds received in battle. (See act 2 Mar. 1903 (32 Stat. 932; 10 U. S. C. 686; M. L. 1939, sec. 1383a).)

2. Any person originally appointed under the provisions of this act at an age greater than 45 years shall, when retired, receive retired pay at the rate of 4 per centum of active pay for each complete year of commissioned service in the United States Army, the total to be not more than 75 per centum: *Provided*, That any officer so appointed, who has been or may hereafter be retired in accordance with law on account of physical disability incident to the service, shall receive, from the date of such retirement, retired pay at the rate of 75 per centum of his active pay at the time of such retirement. (See sec. 24, act 3 June 1916 (39 Stat. 182), as amended by sec. 24, act 4 June 1920 (41 Stat. 771), act 19 May 1926 (44 Stat. 664; 10 U. S. C. 971a; M. L. 1939, sec. 1385).)

In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum of the active duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 per centum of said active duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum for each year of active duty and a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 per centum of the active duty pay as authorized by existing law. (See sec. 15, act 16 June 1942 (56 Stat. 367; 37 U. S. C. 115; M. L. 1939, Sup. II, sec. 1371c-15).)

Retired officers are entitled to credit for active duty performed since retirement in computing the longevity increments and pay periods of their retired pay. The resulting increases in retired pay accrue only from 26 May 1928. (See act 26 May 1928 (45 Stat. 774; 37 U. S. C. 26; M. L. 1939, sec. 1513).)

3. The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of sec. 24b, National Defense Act, 3 June 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity, as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to 12 Nov. 1918, shall be 75 per centum of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue for any period prior to 1 June 1942, as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

The retired pay of any officer who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to 12 Nov. 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 per centum of his active-duty pay at the time of his retirement. (See sec. 15, act 16 June 1942 (56 Stat. 367; 37 U. S. C. 115; M. L. 1939, Sup. II, sec. 1371c-15).)

4. That hereafter the retired pay of officers who were retired on or before 30 June 1922, shall not be less than that provided for the officers of equal rank and length of service retired subsequent to that date: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the pay of any officer now on the retired list. (See act 8 May 1926 (44 Stat. 417). See also sec. 15, act 16 June 1942 (56 Stat. 367; 37 U. S. C. 115; M. L. 1939, Sup. II, sec. 1371c-15).)

5. Retired officers shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty, and when on active-duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active-duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the act approved 17 Dec. 1919, as amended. (See sec. 15, act 16 June 1942 (56 Stat. 367; 37 U. S. C. 115; M. L. 1939, Sup. II, sec. 1371c-15).)

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in adopting the substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senate has made it necessary now to request unanimous consent that the sections of the bill be renumbered consecutively and kept in proper order. I now ask unanimous consent that that be done.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is also necessary that an additional section, a new section, be added. It is exactly the same as the one appearing on page 6 of my amendment, numbered section 12. I shall read it for the information of the Senate:

The increases in pay specified in this act shall be applicable to the active duty, retired, retirement, or retainer pay of all persons whose pay is governed by, or by reference to, those sections of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, which are amended by this act.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have a further amendment to offer. The bill presently provides on page 5—it is now numbered section 9—that the increases in pay shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following its enactment. I move that that section be changed, so that it will read:

The increases in pay provided by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following its enactment, and no increase in pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] whether he is now going to offer the

amendment we were discussing earlier in the day, which would prevent the re-drafting of men who have already served in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, Mr. President; I should like to call up that amendment, when the Senator from South Dakota yields the floor to me.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

**THE CHIEF CLERK.** On page 4, in line 4, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks.

On page 4, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

(5) No individual shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act, if he has served on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; or if he has served on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 6 months after September 16, 1940 (excluding the time that any such individual so served while pursuing a course of

instruction in a university, college, or other similar institution of learning). The provisions of this paragraph shall cease to be effective during any period after January 1, 1946, when the Congress or the President shall declare that the national interest is imperiled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the amendment itself is explanatory. All it does is to prohibit the drafting of veterans who have an honorable discharge. If they have served on foreign soil they may not be redrafted. If they have served in this country for less than a certain number of months, or their time has been spent entirely in school and they have not received 6 months of boot training, they may be drafted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as I had sent to the desk an amendment which is practically the same as the one which has been offered by the Senator from Colorado, I shall not call it up. I ask to join with the Senator in the amendment which he has offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I invited the Senator from Nebraska to join with the Senator from Colorado, inasmuch as he had an amendment on the same subject. The amendment which has now been read had the approval of not only the Selective Service attorneys but the legislative counsel attorneys. They worked out the details of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will further yield to me, I wish to ask him only one question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield if I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any appreciable number of men who did not serve outside the continental United States who would be in any way affected by this amendment? A distinction is made in the amendment between those who serve outside the continental United States and those who serve within. My understanding is that those who did not serve outside the continental United States would be required to serve 6 months or more, but could not be reinducted. Is there an appreciable number of those who did not serve 6 months and who, of course, did not serve outside the continental United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I believe there are very few of those men. However, we know that 1,500 men were sent to dental school at the cost of the Government and that they did not serve in that field. The Army needs them badly as technicians. They were given their education free of charge. The difference between the Senator's bill and the amendment which is now before the Senate, is that those 1,500 dentists may be used.

Mr. WHERRY. They can be reinducted and brought back into the service. That is the point I wished to get into the RECORD. I feel that some objection may be raised later on. I believe that if the Senator would continue with his remarks a little further, probably he would develop the fact that if the men could not be reinducted into the service, those who

are now in would probably have to remain in the service longer than otherwise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. They served in school for a period during the war in order to acquire skill in their profession. The Army now needs them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I was on my feet before the Chair put the question to the Senate. I wanted to ask a question of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to try to answer the question.

Mr. TUNNELL. How many months would a man be required to serve under the amendment in order to be exempt from being reinducted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One day in overseas service.

Mr. TUNNELL. And on this side, 6 months?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Renumber sections (e), items (1) and (2), as section (e), items (2) and (3) and insert new subsection (e) (1), as follows:

"Full-time students in graduate or undergraduate studies in scientific and engineering schools and others engaged in the teaching of science and engineering subjects, and all men engaged as professional personnel in scientific or engineering activities and all men engaged as essential technicians in scientific research and development shall be required to register but, upon certification under appropriate regulations prescribed by the President, shall be deferred from training and service so long as they are so engaged."

Line 4 of present subsection (e) (1), change "those men" to "those other men."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain unnecessarily the Senate at this hour, but I think this amendment is very vital. Probably it is not so immediate in its importance with regard to our present commitments, but it is vital to the welfare of the Nation.

If we are to continue even for a limited period of time the drafting of men into the military service, it is obvious that we should not interfere with the training of our scientific and technological students who will be the basis of the future scientific development in this country.

Mr. President, this amendment is not designed to exempt any person from serving in the defense of our country. As a matter of fact, the amendment would take a certain small class of persons out from under the draft and place them in a position where they could give more of their time and knowledge to the national defense than if they were placed in some other category. It is obvious to all of us that since the war some of the men in the laboratories have

proved to be of more value in our future defense than perhaps 500 or 1,000 men marching up and down a parade field.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator's amendment define the term "scientist"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I appreciate how difficult it is to define the term "scientist." However, I believe that I have a solution of the difficulty. The Senator will notice that in the amendment all men engaged in technical or highly scientific studies, or engaged in teaching highly technical or engineering subjects, "shall be required to register but, upon certification under appropriate regulations prescribed by the President, shall be deferred from training."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Are not such men deferred at the present time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If technically they are deferred, in practice it has not so worked out.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Selective Service have a right to defer scientists?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I presume the draft boards have the right to exercise considerable authority in deferring any man, but the practice has been, however, without a legislative mandate, not to defer so-called highly scientific students. The proof of the pudding has been in the fact that there is a shortage of scientists and students who are studying in that field, to an extent which is truly alarming. I wish to quote so eminent an authority as Dr. Vannevar Bush in his famous report to President Roosevelt in 1945.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the Senator realizes, does he not, that all the men who worked in connection with scientific projects were deferred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, men who, for a period during the war, actually worked in the Hanford and Oak Ridge bomb plants in connection with the development of the atomic bomb, shortly after the war ended were drafted into the Army without any credit being given to them for what they had already done.

Mr. MAYBANK. Were the scientists drafted?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

I was about to quote Dr. Bush. In his report to President Roosevelt in 1945, he said, among other things:

The deficit of science and technology students who, but for the war, would have received bachelor's degrees is about 150,000. It is estimated that the deficit of those obtaining advanced degrees in these fields will amount in 1955 to about 17,000, for it takes at least 6 years from college entry to achieve a doctor's degree or its equivalent in science or engineering. The real ceiling on our productivity of new scientific knowledge and its application in the war against disease, and the development of new products and new industries, is the number of trained scientists available.

The training of a scientist is a long and expensive process. Studies clearly show that

there are talented individuals in every part of the population, but with few exceptions those without the means of buying higher education go without it. If ability and not the circumstance of family fortune determines who shall receive higher education in science, then we shall be assured of constantly improving quality at every level of scientific activity. The Government should provide a reasonable number of undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships in order to develop scientific talent in American youth. The plans should be designed to attract into science only that proportion of youthful talent appropriate to the needs of science in relation to the other needs of the Nation for high abilities.

Including those in uniform: The most immediate prospect of making up the deficit in scientific personnel is to develop the scientific talent in the generation now in uniform. Even if we should start now to train the current crop of high-school graduates, none would complete graduate studies before 1951. The armed services should comb their records for men who prior to or during the war have given evidence of talent for science, and make prompt arrangements, consistent with current discharge plans, for ordering those who remain in uniform, as soon as militarily possible, to duty at institutions here and overseas where they can continue their scientific education. Moreover, the services should see that those who study overseas have the benefit of the latest scientific information resulting from research during the war.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Washington understands, of course, that I do not question his knowledge of the situation. Under the selective draft law I had assumed that local boards were given full authority to defer the induction of men in the class to which the Senator has referred, if they wished to exercise such authority.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That may be correct. I do not know how to interpret the actions of some of the local draft boards. I have a report, which was submitted in the hearings conducted on the scientific research foundation bill, in which the Secretary of War himself, in answer to questions, suggested that this be done, and told us at the time that he was going to write General Hershey and ask that it be done. As a matter of fact, it has not been done, and I think it is time, because of the importance of the matter, that we make it a definite provision in the pending bill. It involves a small number of men, men who may be more vital to the future of our country, than all the men we draft into the Army in the next year. We are the only country in the world which drafted its scientific personnel during the war. For example, Russia not only exempts them from military service, but sets them up in a special status in the Russian economy.

We are far behind the rest of the world in basic science. We lead the world, of course, in applied science, but there is a great shortage of scientists, and if we continue to draft men who would be going into the higher specialized studies, I think we will regret it in the future, so far as the national defense is concerned. As I said before, one of these men studying in a laboratory might be worth more to us than great numbers who might be drafted to march up and down a parade field under the pending bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I wish to corroborate what the Senator from Washington has said. In my State several hundred scientists received no consideration during the war so far as deferment was concerned. I think it is a distinct set-back to the war effort when we refuse to recognize them as subject to deferment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator whether under the amendment the President would be permitted to set up the type or kind of classification which would include some scientists and exclude other scientists?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that is the very purpose of the amendment. It is rather a standard practice in this country for colleges to recognize certain studies as scientific studies. I know that to the lay mind there is sometimes a distinction as to what is science and what is not science. I do not think the President, under the amendment, would say that a man studying what has come to be known as social science would be exempt, or that a man studying sociology would be exempt. Some have called law a science. But what we are talking about, and what the President and those in the scientific world absolutely know is our intention, is the highly technical scientist, the expert in chemistry, biology, and all such sciences, with which we will have to fight a future war, and must develop for the defense of the Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to have the Record clear that the amendment does not include all scientists, and that the President of the United States, under the amendment, would have the discretionary power to make the classification he would feel necessary to carry on the type of work which the amendment contemplates.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct, and probably the President of the United States himself would take the advice of the military as to what type of men they wanted deferred so that they might devote their time to a particular scientific research for the national defense.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, it would be difficult to spell it out in an amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I have heard the amendment read only once, and I should like to have the language read which the Senator says give the President the power to determine what is science.

Mr. HILL. I have the amendment here. Would the Senator like to have me read it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. The amendment reads:

Renumber sections (e), items (1) and (2), as section (e), items (2) and (3) and insert new subsection (e) (1), as follows:

"Full-time students in graduate or undergraduate studies in scientific and engineering schools and others engaged in the teaching

of science and engineering subjects, and all men engaged as professional personnel in scientific or engineering activities and all men engaged as essential technicians in scientific research and development shall be required to register but upon certification under appropriate regulations prescribed by the President, shall be deferred from training and service so long as they are so engaged."

Mr. GREEN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington whether that does give the President power to determine what is science. They all must register, and he is to provide regulations. That does not give him the power to determine whether they come within the scope of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the regulations would prescribe what studies would be considered as being the realm of science.

Mr. GREEN. In the way it reads, it gives the President the power to make regulations of that kind. All the men have to register, and he is to determine whether they shall be called, but it does not say he can distinguish between different men.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator that it was the intention of the Senator from Washington to confer that power upon the President by the wording used. The wording was worked over by many of us, and we decided this was the appropriate wording to take care of the situation.

Mr. GREEN. I am merely questioning whether it is capable of that construction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should be glad to add to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Suppose, for instance, Christian Scientists should say, "We are scientists, and we have to register now. The President has no discretion as to whether we are exempt or not."

Mr. MAGNUSON. The President could prescribe appropriate regulations.

Mr. GREEN. Regulations as to what?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The regulations would say that men who were engaged in scientific studies on this, that, or the other, in scientific fields, should be exempt.

Mr. GREEN. Read the language again. I do not know that it requires that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He would not so certify, otherwise.

Mr. HILL. Has the Senator conferred with the Selective Service about the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that the Office of Scientific Research and Development conferred with the Selective Service, and the amendment was drawn up by them, in cooperation with me.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator say the Office of Scientific Research and Development?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; what we call the OSRD.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know whether that office has conferred with the War and Navy Departments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know whether they conferred with the War and Navy Departments, but I know that Secretary Patterson in testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Military Affairs, when we were discussing the

National Scientific Research Foundation, testified on the subject. Both Secretary Patterson and Navy Secretary Forrestal endorsed the same suggestion that is made in the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator say that in their testimony both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy indicated they thought this should be done?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Did they think it should be done by amendment to the law, or did they say it could already be done?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I recall, the Secretary of the Navy was very emphatic about it. The Secretary of War thought it should be done, and he said he was going to write a letter to General Hershey recommending that it be done.

Mr. President, this is too serious a matter to be allowed to be neglected. I imagine every Senator has received letters pointing out certain cases where very valuable scientific men have been taken in the draft into the Army or Navy, men who might well be doing more for the defense of their country in the positions they held, rather than going out and shouldering guns.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to say that from my point of view the amendment should make it clear whom it is exempting. As the Senator from South Carolina said a few moments ago, the selective-service boards have the power to defer chemists or scientific men who are needed in the fields in which they have qualified themselves; but such persons have to go and make proof, and sometimes it is extremely difficult. I have known cases where the draft has taken men away from important posts in a factory producing war materials, and it has taken 3 or 4 months to get them back, and it has been a very difficult thing to accomplish. Nearly every college president with whom I have come in contact is very much in favor of having scientific people exempted, up to the point where the exemption is not abused.

I have not seen the Senator's amendment, I have only heard it read, but I can conceive of it being a haven for many persons who want to escape duty under the Selective Service. On the other hand, I see a very great necessity for preserving the necessary scientific men for use in the war plants and laboratories.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might say to the Senator from New Jersey that I have in my files, although I have not brought them here, letters from probably 90 percent of the known scientists of this country, men such as Dr. Bush, Dr. Compton, Dr. Oppenheimer, Dr. Bowman, of Johns Hopkins, and probably 85 percent of the men at the head of great universities with scientific departments, asking that some action such as this be taken, because otherwise they are afraid for the future defense of our country.

Great Britain and Russia have made much greater strides than we have in the development of basic science since the war began, because they treated the

scientists differently from the way in which we have treated them.

We know how reluctant the draft board in a small town is to say, "We are going to take Johnny Jones and let Jimmie Smith stay here because Jimmie Smith says he is going to the university and study chemistry." It is difficult for the draft boards to act properly and uniformly without some definite policy.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree with the Senator from Washington. Does he feel that his amendment as presented does not open the door to abuse? That is the important thing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only abuse to which it could be open would be to have the President of the United States designate studies or teachers instructing in the universities in things which were not scientific. I do not think he would. I think there are certain basic ranges, certain basic paths, in which all universities and all scientists have said, "This is what we call pure science."

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes, I am sure, that the only point I have in mind is that when one class is exempted, other classes will consider themselves to be similarly essential and that they should be exempted. I am very much in favor, however, of the principle involved in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I have read the amendment carefully and I think the ambiguity depends upon the placing in it of the words "upon certification," because it does not say what should be certified. If those words were stricken, and the language then would be "shall be required to register but, under appropriate regulation prescribed by the President, shall be deferred," I think the amendment would be clarified.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Rhode Island suggests that the words "upon certification" be stricken out, so the amendment would then read "shall be required to register but, under appropriate regulations prescribed by the President, shall be deferred from training."

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would be glad to accept that amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the two words be stricken from the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is unnecessary. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want to take much more of the time of the Senate. This matter may not seem to some to be so very important insofar as our immediate commitments are concerned with respect to our armed forces in our own country and throughout the world; but I think in the future the adoption of such an amendment will pay great dividends from the standpoint of both the military and civilian development of science. I hope the Senate will be far-sighted enough in this matter to do what all other great nations in the

world have done, so that we may not only keep up with the rest of the world but make sure that America is ahead of the world in the matter of basic scientific development.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I believe that by the adoption of this amendment, by undertaking to create a group with special privileges over all other groups in the United States, we would be advancing backward. There is a principle that governs the matter of deferments, and it is one that is the result of much experience through other wars as well as the last war. In the Selective Training and Service Act we find this principle carried throughout:

No \* \* \* deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution.

Everyone must have his claim considered on its own merits and singly. We have taken care of any individual scientist who has been needed for the public health or safety or interest. The existing law gives the President ample power to make regulations for deferment of all such scientists. We do not need any special attention from this very powerful lobby group in connection with an extension of the Draft Act.

Mr. President, in my 15 years of experience in the Senate I have never encountered such a tremendous propaganda outfit as the group of professors who are undoubtedly behind this amendment. Throughout our consideration of the atomic energy measure we were constantly under their fire and under their pressure, and we have before us to be considered at some time, perhaps—I hope it will not come up during the present session—a concrete proposal which they desire to have written into law, which would nationalize the entire subject of science and start the destruction of private patent law and private initiative.

Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks sections 5 (e) and (f) of the Selective Training and Service Act to show and have the RECORD carry the fact that there is ample provision for deferment of scientists if they come within the general rule that they are necessary, that they ought to be deferred in order to maintain national health, safety, or interest. I also want this considered as bearing upon the subject of students, for there has already been provided and there is in the existing law an opportunity for students in colleges who were caught by age during the college course, to complete their year and be deferred for that purpose. With that statement I conclude. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

(e) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the

national health, safety, or interest. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States (1) of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution.

(f) Any person who, during the year 1940, entered upon attendance for the academic year 1940-41—

(1) at any college or university which grants a degree in arts or science, to pursue a course of instruction satisfactory completion of which is prescribed by such college or university as a prerequisite to either of such degrees; or

(2) at any university described in paragraph (1), to pursue a course of instruction to the pursuit of which a degree in arts or science is prescribed by such university as a prerequisite;

and who, while pursuing such course of instruction at such college or university, is selected for training and service under this act prior to the end of such academic year, or prior to July 1, 1941, whichever occurs first, shall, upon his request, be deferred from induction into the land or naval forces for such training and service until the end of such academic year, but in no event later than July 1, 1941.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that ever since we passed the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 different groups, honest and sincere though they be, have been knocking on the door of Congress trying to get special deferment for members of their own group?

Mr. AUSTIN. That has been true.

Mr. HILL. We have been confronted with the question of trying to hold the line as against each one of these groups seeking some preferment or preference for itself or for its members. Congress has steadfastly withstood that pressure and steadfastly held the line. If we open the door now to permit this group to come in, there will be tremendous pressure from the other groups to let them come in. Is that not true?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator said, in writing the Selective Training and Service Act, Congress put in it the provisions to which the Senator has just referred, under which the President, if he sees fit, can defer scientific men, and can defer others of other groups. Is that not true?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is so. Professional men, doctors, dentists.

Mr. HILL. Yes; doctors and dentists. The Senator, I am sure, will corroborate the statement that men have been deferred who belong to those professions, and others have been deferred who belong to other professions.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Men were deferred during the very midst of the war under the provisions to which the Senator referred. Is that not true?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. As a matter of fact, in all the instances that I can recall an effort has been made in the committee toward bringing about this deferment, but we were not caught, as we are tonight, with an amendment offered on the floor for the first time which runs absolutely in the face of the policy of the Selective Training and Service Act.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Vermont deserves a brief answer. I do not know what one would call the fine, patriotic scientists of America for believing so sincerely that the welfare and the future of this country might be impaired because we lag behind other countries in scientific development. One may call them propagandists, one may call them by any other name. The truth of the matter is that regardless of whether this authority existed or not, during the war scientists were not exempted, and that if we continue the draft in peacetime they will not be exempted, and America will fall behind. The truth of the matter is also that without scientific development we probably would not have won the war, and without it surely we cannot win any future war, regardless of how many men we place in the armed forces and march up and down the field and train with guns. These scientific men believe this provision is vital. They are eminent Americans. Surely they may have some differences of opinion.

The Senator from Alabama spoke of their knocking on the door of Congress. The Senate has exempted agricultural workers because it thought the country needed them for the maintenance of our food supply. I assert, Mr. President, that for the defense of the country we need scientists more than we have ever needed any other group of individuals. If we think we can fight a future war to defend America without full scientific development then we are not only moving backward, I will say to the Senator from Vermont, but we are being most shortsighted in respect to what is needed for the defense of our country.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator aware of the fact that we took young technicians and young engineers out of Navy testing stations and put them into the Army? Is the Senator aware that the senior technicians told the members of the Senate that such action hopelessly crippled their work? I will say to the Senate that we will win the next war with brains and not with brawn, and unless we keep abreast of scientific developments and unless we use our seed-corn as it should be used, instead of marching these young men up and down the parade grounds with guns in their hands and in close formation, then I fear for the result if we should be so unfortunate as to have another war.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Connecticut is correct. Instances of that kind that I know of have been repeated in connection with various atomic bomb plants. Mr. President, I should like to read what the Secretary of War

said about this matter in the hearing on the National Research Foundation bill. The Secretary spoke in answer to a question asked by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]:

Secretary PATTERSON. I have had many talks with Dr. Bush upon this point. I am in favor of deferring men who have been partially trained, at any rate, in scientific research, who are promising in that field—I am in favor of deferment of them so that they can continue their research work, largely of a post-graduate character, in pure or applied research and development of a scientific character; that is, as of the present.

The testimony of the Secretary of the Navy is of similar import. I appreciate that many people are knocking on the doors of Congress and trying to be exempted. The Senate and the House have exempted many classes of people. Amendments have been proposed by many groups. This amendment is not exempting anyone from serving in the defense of his country. I say the amendment is taking these men out of the Army itself and placing them where they are going to be of 10 times more value for the defense of the country than if they are drafted, which is the very purpose of the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I should like to ask the able Senator from South Dakota to take to conference. It provides for the transfer of the function of the Selective Service pertaining to the priority of employment to Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service. I ask him to take it to conference for the reason that under date of May 16, in a message from the President of the United States to the Congress in respect to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946, there appears the following language:

There is hereby transferred to the United States Employment Service so much of the functions of the Selective Service System and of the Director of Selective Service under section 8 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 890, ch. 720) as relates to aiding persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty or of training and service under the said act in securing positions other than the positions held by them prior to said period.

The difficulty with the President's transfer is that under the limitation of his powers with respect to organization he cannot go beyond the expiration date. If this law should not be reenacted for any reason—and we are facing a dead line of July 1—of course the power which he transferred would die with the present bill. This is the reason why I should like to take it to conference and see whether or not it is advisable to enact the provision which I shall send to the desk.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator realizes, of course, that the reemployment question is a very large subject. I hope he will not ask us to go into it this evening. Personally, I think the committee very definitely decided to leave the reemployment service of veterans where it is today, with the selective service system. Personally I should like to see it stay where it is, because all the draft board members in every county in the United States are operating very satisfactorily at the moment. They are having no trouble with the reemployment of veterans. I should like to see the service remain where it is. If the selective service law were reenacted on July 1, I am sure that it would be best to leave the service where it is, with the local boards and the national headquarters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The difficulty to which I wish to invite the Senator's attention is that the President has transferred it out of Selective Service. While he may transfer the function so long as it is active, if it should expire under the Selective Service and Training Act, then, of course, his transfer would be invalid. It is a function which ought to continue, because these rights are being given to all the men who are being drafted at the present time.

Mr. GURNEY. If the Senator remembers, of course the committee considered that question, and we decided to leave it where it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We did not consider the President's transfer. The President has transferred this function, and has changed the whole complexion of the thing. All I am asking is that the Senator take the amendment to conference. If he finds that there is no merit in it, of course, it can be thrown out, and I shall have no complaint. But I think it is a matter which we ought to take to conference, because it is very evident, as I understand, that the President's transfer has considerably confused the whole question.

Mr. GURNEY. Inasmuch as we are not going to be able to finish consideration of the bill this evening because of the substitute presently to be offered, I think it would be better if we were to consider the matter of reemployment tomorrow, when possibly a greater number of Senators will be present. I wonder whether the Senator will withhold the amendment and offer it tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is satisfactory, except that I wish to place in the RECORD at this time a copy of my amendment, a copy of the transfer order of the President, part IX of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946; also the limitations on the powers of the President with respect to reorganization, being section 5, paragraph (a), subparagraphs 3 and 4, of the Reorganization Act of 1945; also section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act.

I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD an article appearing in Selective Service, a newspaper dedicated to selective service. The article is entitled "Million Future Veterans Face Job Rights Loss."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEL, in the chair). Is there objection

to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado to the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other purposes, viz: Beginning on page 4, line 13, strike out all down to and including line 3, on page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 7. (a) Section 16 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) All of the provisions of this act, except the provisions of section 3 (c), 3 (d), and 8, and the fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a), shall become inoperative and cease to apply on and after May 15, 1947, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date."

"(b) Effective July 1, 1946, the functions of the Personnel Division (created pursuant to section 8 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940) of the Selective Service System are transferred to the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service. The President is authorized to transfer to the Veterans' Employment Service any of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations which have been utilized or available for use in the administration of the functions transferred by this section.

"(c) Effective July 1, 1946, section 600 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (relating to the membership of the Veterans' Placement Service Board), is amended by striking out "the Director of the National Selective Service System" and inserting in lieu thereof "the President of the Civil Service Commission."

[From Selective Training and Service Act]

Sec. 8. (a) Any person inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for training and service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of training and service under section 3 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of training and service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for training and service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such training and service and a medical statement showing any physical defects noted upon such examination; and upon the completion of his period of training and service under section 3 (b), each such person shall be given another physical examination and shall be given a medical statement showing any injuries, illnesses, or disabilities suffered by him during such period of training and service.

(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such training and service, has left or leaves a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, (2) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (3) makes application for reemployment within 40 days after he is relieved from such training and service—

(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, such person shall be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay;

(B) if such position was in the employ of a private employer, such employer shall restore such person to such position or to a

position of like seniority, status, and pay unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

(c) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of training and service in the land or naval forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time such person was inducted into such forces, and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

(d) Section 3 (c) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to authorize the President to order members and units of reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service," approved August 27, 1940, is amended to read, as follows:

"(c) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of active military service, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time such person was ordered into such service, and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration."

(e) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) or subsection (c), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, to specifically require such employer to comply with such provisions, and, as an incident thereto, to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action. The court shall order a speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof to specifically require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against the person so applying for such benefits.

(f) Section 3 (d) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to authorize the President to order members and units of Reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service," approved August 27, 1940, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the

first sentence the following: "and, as an incident thereto, to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action."

(g) The Director of Selective Service herein provided for shall establish a Personnel Division with adequate facilities to render aid in the replacement in their former positions of, or in securing positions for, members of the reserve components of the land and naval forces of the United States who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty, and persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of their training and service under this act.

(h) Any person inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service under this act shall, during the period of such training and service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside of such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence for longer than 1 day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election.

(i) It is the expressed policy of the Congress that whenever a vacancy is caused in the employment rolls of any business or industry by reason of induction into the service of the United States of an employee pursuant to the provisions of this act such vacancy shall not be filled by any person who is a member of the Communist Party or the German-American Bund.

[From Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946]

#### PART IX. UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

SEC. 901. Placement functions under Selective Training and Service Act of 1940: There is hereby transferred to the United States Employment Service so much of the functions of the Selective Service System and of the Director of Selective Service under section 8 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 890, ch. 720) as relates to aiding persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty or of training and service under the said act in securing positions other than the positions held by them prior to said period.

[From Reorganization Act of 1945]

#### LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(3) Continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) Continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

[From Selective Service magazine of April-May 1946]

#### MILLION FUTURE VETERANS FACE JOB-RIGHTS LOSS

A million or more of the men inducted into the armed forces by next July 1 face the loss of the reemployment rights guaranteed to them by the Selective Service Act if that law is not extended beyond that date or other provision made to protect them.

It is estimated that 5,000,000 of the approximately 15,000,000 men who entered the armed forces during World War II were entitled to reinstatement to their old jobs under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Of this number possibly as many as 4,000,000 veterans with reinstatement rights will have been separated from the armed forces by July 1. Thus, approximately 1,000,000 men still in service on July 1 will lose their reemployment rights under the Selective Service Act if the act is allowed to expire on that date.

The provisions of the Selective Service Act guaranteeing reemployment rights to men inducted into the armed forces expire on July 1 and unless these rights are extended, there would be no existing statute protecting the reemployment rights of men inducted under the act who were still in the armed forces on that date.

#### DISCHARGEES ALSO JEOPARDIZED

Even the reemployment rights of veterans who already have been discharged would be jeopardized by the expiration of the act.

While it is the opinion of National Headquarters, Selective Service System, that the reemployment rights of the veterans who already have been restored to their old jobs under the act would not be extinguished, this is not free from doubt. Moreover, the reemployment rights of discharged veterans who have not yet been restored to their former positions would be in grave doubt.

Even where their reemployment rights are not lost by the expiration of the act, veterans might find that the means of enforcing such rights were considerably diminished.

#### MANY BENEFITS IMPERILED

Under the law as it now stands, discharged veterans whose rights have been violated may file suit in the Federal district court and may have the United States district attorney act as their attorney without any cost to the veteran, and with the assurance that the case will be advanced on the court calendar for a speedy hearing. Should these provisions expire, veterans who are able to bring their cases within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts probably would lose the benefit of representation by the United States district attorney, the right to have their cases advanced on the court calendar, and would become subject to court costs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I now call up an amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and myself, and send it to the desk. I ask that it be read by the clerk.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in the RECORD in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of it be dispensed with and that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I object. I do not ask that it be read at this time, but I ask that it be read at the proper time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I see no objection to having it printed in the RECORD. It can still be read tomorrow.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be very glad to have it printed in the RECORD as of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment (in the nature of a substitute) intended to be proposed by Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WHERRY) to the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other

purposes, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1946' and inserting in lieu thereof 'May 15, 1947': *Provided*, That no individual shall be inducted for training and service under such act unless the Congress by law declares that national security requires that inductions be resumed.

"Sec. 2. (a) There shall be discharged from or relieved from active duty in the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such forces, or any component part of either, who applies therefor and who has on the date of enactment of this act one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to anyone who has volunteered for service in the Army or the Navy.

"(b) Section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each man heretofore inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) who shall have served for a training and service period of at least 18 months shall be discharged upon his written application for discharge, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit: *Provided*, That the foregoing provision shall not apply to any person who has voluntarily enlisted for a longer period of service."

"Sec. 3. This act shall not be deemed to affect the existing program of the Army and Navy for the discharge of men in the service on other grounds and for other reasons not named in this act, but shall be construed as an additional ground and reason in the demobilization and discharge of servicemen from the Army and the Navy.

"Sec. 4. Any person discharged under the provisions of this act shall be given and granted an honorable discharge, unless for cause found to be not entitled to honorable discharge.

"Sec. 5. The fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows: *Provided further*, That on July 1, 1946, the number of men in active training or service in the Army shall not exceed 1,550,000, and that this number shall be reduced consistently month by month so that the Army's strength shall be 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947: *And provided further*, That on July 1, 1947, the number of men in active training or service in the Navy shall be 558,000 and in the Marine Corps 108,000."

"Sec. 6. (a) The first paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, \$140; enlisted men of the second grade, \$118; enlisted men of the third grade, \$106; enlisted men of the fourth grade, \$94; enlisted men of the fifth grade, \$82; enlisted men of the sixth grade, \$70; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, \$65. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of \$132."

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following its enactment, and no increase in pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act."

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand that tomorrow we will proceed with the amendment which has just been made the order of business. I ask at this time that I be recognized to speak upon this amendment tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Austin	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Ball	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Huffman	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Burch	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Knowland	Shipstead
Butler	La Follette	Smith
Byrd	Langer	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Wagner
Ferguson	Mead	Walsh
Fulbright	Millikin	Wheeler
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Green	Morse	Wiley
Gurney	Murdock	Wilson
Hart	O'Daniel	
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it will take only a minute and a half or so to dispose of the business on the Executive Calendar. When that is done, if the Senate wishes to return to legislative session, that may be done. But I see no point in returning to legislative session at this time, when the business on the Executive Calendar will not take more than a minute or two.

Mr. MAYBANK. Very well, Mr. President; I withhold my motion.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations, and withdrawal of a nomination, this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Brig. Gen. Harry Hawkins Vaughan (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States, to be major general.

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Raymond Michael Foley, of Michigan, to be Federal Housing Administrator in the National Housing Agency for a term of 4 years from June 30, 1946 (reappointment).

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Samuel J. Leach, to be postmaster at Hersey, Mich.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service;

Midshipman William T. Sweetman, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of June 1946;

Midshipman Robert N. Barker to be an ensign in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1946, in lieu of appointment as an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated and confirmed;

Midshipman Raymond W. Sitz to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign from the 5th day of June 1946, in lieu of appointment as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps as previously nominated and confirmed;

Midshipman Robert H. Wilson to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of June 1946, in lieu of appointment as an ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed; and

Sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Calendar.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Fahy, of New Mexico, to be legal adviser of the Department of State.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, two nominations have been passed over for several days, upon request, one being the nomination of Mr. Bay, to be ambassador to Norway. The nominations were passed over because the Senator from North Dakota desired to make some remarks relative to it. He has assured me that if it goes over one more time he will say what he has to say about it when the Senate holds another executive session.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the two nominations be passed over again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the two nominations previously passed over will be passed over again.

The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I also ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed, including those confirmed earlier in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations on this day.

#### RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable, and the Senator from Kentucky has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a statement. Earlier in the day I requested the Senate to be prepared to have an evening session, in the hope that we might dispose of the draft measure today. As the day wore on and as the evening wore on, it became doubtful, and it is now doubtful, whether we could dispose of the bill without remaining here later than most Members seem to desire to remain. The Senator from West Virginia has offered a substitute, upon which he has advised me he intends to speak at length, and no doubt that will call for addresses on the part of other Senators. It occurred to me that we might not be able to finish consideration of the bill until 12 or 1 o'clock.

In the meantime, many Senators have come to my desk and have urged that I not attempt to keep the Senate in session until such an hour as that. Acting upon that suggestion, I advised various Senators that I would not undertake to do so, and that as soon as the Senate disposed of everything except the Revercomb amendment, as far as we could see, I would move that the Senate take a recess.

Based upon that suggestion, some Senators have left the Chamber, with the understanding that there would be no vote.

I did not know that it was the desire of some Senators to remain here very much longer, until I had suggested that the Senate take a recess, whereupon various Senators have come to me and have protested rather vigorously and have rather resented the fact that I suggested that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. President, the Senate can do as it pleases about the matter. If it wishes to stay here longer, it is at liberty to do so. However, inasmuch as I stated that I would move that the Senate take a recess, I feel compelled to make a motion to take a recess, and I do make that motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have the floor; but I withhold the motion, and I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I feel that the majority leader is at all times very considerate of the wishes of the Senate; and what I am about to say, I feel sure, will in no sense be taken to be a criticism of his performance of his very arduous duties, which he discharges so well.

Let me point out, however, that the information was rather widespread that the Senate would stay in session tonight and would dispose of the draft bill. A number of us arranged our evenings accordingly, and, for that matter, rearranged our schedules for the following day, which is tomorrow, realizing that the business of the Senate came first. After we have rearranged our evenings—and many other Senators found themselves in the same circumstances—we now find that the Senate is meeting until 8:30, and that now it is proposed that we do not have an evening session, after all.

I did not know we were going to take a recess at this time. The word which reached me was that the Senate would stay in session until this bill was disposed of tonight, if possible. It was only 8:30 when the plans apparently were changed. I knew nothing of that. I could have accommodated myself very easily to such a change in plans, but I did not know of it.

My point is that when we have received word that we are to have an evening session and when we have accordingly rearranged our schedules, we should have an evening session; or if we are not to have an evening session, we should not start with one. I say that with no criticism of anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. TYDINGS. But inasmuch as many Senators, to my personal knowledge, have stayed here, I think we should go through with it and should have an evening session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not say that we have not had an evening session. The session has not been as late as sessions which we have previously held. But the Senator from South Dakota, who is in charge of the pending bill, and who has assumed the burden of having the bill favorably considered by the Senate, is one of those who suggested to me that the Senate recess and not take up the Revercomb proposal until tomorrow. As I have already said, it is entirely within the province of the Senate to do as it pleases. I have also rearranged my evening, but I do not feel that because of that fact I must remain here all night. However, I am willing to do so. If the Senate wishes to remain in session, I am perfectly willing to remain.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not interested in rearranging my evening. I would be interested in rearranging my morning. However, I do not quite understand why, merely because some Senator suggests at 10 minutes to 9 in the evening that we take a recess, after we have been

here 2 hours following the beginning of the evening, we should not continue in session and accomplish something. I well appreciate that through the able leadership of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] we have accomplished much today. I am not unmindful of that fact. But I cannot understand why, at 10 minutes to 9, we must recess until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the pending motion is to resume legislative business, and the motion is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself had asked that the Senate resume legislative business, and I thought that the request had been favorably acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was trying to make an announcement with reference to the request of the Senator from South Carolina. When the Senator from Kentucky made a motion to recess, the Senate was still in executive session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

#### EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in view of the statements which have been made, and in view of the fact that I had the floor at the end of the legislative session, I wish to make a statement.

This matter was brought to my attention not upon my suggestion, but upon the suggestion of others who were leading the fight for the pending bill. The unfair thing about it is that after word went out that a recess would be taken, Senators left the Chamber. I know of one Senator who left who expects to speak upon the amendment which has been offered. It would be very unfair to him if we were now to proceed, after an understanding of the kind—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a moment I will yield. If we proceed further and deprive the Senator to whom I refer of his right to discuss the amendment, it will be very unfair to him. We have always relied on the assurances of the majority leader, and, so far as I am concerned, we shall continue to do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now recess.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have made a motion, Mr. President, that the Senate now take a recess.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Austin	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Radcliffe
Briggs	Kilgore	Reed
Brooks	Knowland	Revercomb
Burch	La Follette	Robertson
Bushfield	Langer	Russell
Byrd	McCarran	Saltonstall
Connally	McClellan	Stanfill
Donnell	McFarland	Stewart
Ferguson	McKellar	Taft
Fulbright	McMahon	Tobey
Green	Magnuson	Tunnell
Gurney	Maybank	Tydings
Hart	Millikin	Wagner
Hawkes	Mitchell	Walsh
Hayden	Moore	White
Hickenlooper	Morse	Wiley
Hill	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia that the Senate now take a recess.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, without prejudice to the rights of any other Senator to make a similar motion, if he cares to do so, I withdraw my motion that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to say to my good friend the Senator from West Virginia that when I asked him on this floor to yield to me he would not do so. I regret very much his refusal.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I thought I yielded at the end of my statement.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator did not yield, and it necessitated my suggesting the absence of a quorum. I merely desire to correct his statement that I would be one to cut off free debate in the Senate, and if there is any question about the statement having been made, I should like to have the official reporter read my remarks.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I would not for a moment make any statement which would reflect on the Senator from South Carolina. I said that if we did not take a recess at this time, but continued in session, it would be unfair to Senators who have already left the Chamber and wish to speak upon the pending amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was going to suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that if any arrangement for a time tomorrow when those who have had to leave tonight could be heard, I should be the first one to join in such an arrangement. I was rather sorry that I did not have a chance to make these remarks until it became necessary, under the rules, for me to call a quorum. Otherwise I would not have done so.

Mr. President, the pending question is on the motion that the Senate take a recess, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to recess has been withdrawn.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I renew my request to the able Senator in charge of the bill that he take my amendment to conference in order that the amendment may be considered, because I feel strongly, and my feeling is concurred in by the legislative counsel of the Senate, that the President's order transferring the priority employment features of the Selective Service and Training Act to another service has confused the situation considerably. My amendment would straighten it out. If my amendment has no merit, when it goes to conference he will have no difficulty in having it thrown out; but I do think it would be a matter of wisdom to have it in conference, at least, and see whether or not it should be kept in the bill or left out of the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I said before, if we were going to finish consideration of the bill tonight, I would be glad to comply with the Senator's request. If the Senate is to recess until tomorrow, I hope the Senator will withhold the amendment so that other Senators who are not here tonight may consider it, and we can vote on it very quickly tomorrow. If we are to recess tonight and not complete the bill, I hope the Senator will continue to withhold the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My understanding was that we were going to complete the bill, and that is why I renewed my request.

Mr. GURNEY. If the Senator will withhold it until we find out whether the Senate is to recess, I shall be very grateful.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to reiterate what I said awhile ago with reference to whether the Senate shall recess or not. One of the reasons why I was impelled to suggest that a recess be taken was that the Senator from South Dakota, in charge of the bill, suggested, when the Senator from Colorado offered his amendment, that in all likelihood we could not finish the bill tonight, and asked him that it go over until tomorrow when we could resume consideration of the amendment, and that was agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, and, as I understood, he withdrew the amendment. Whereupon the Senator from West Virginia secured the floor and offered a substitute.

I always try to cooperate with a Senator who has the responsibility of conducting legislation through the Senate, and when the Senator from South Dakota suggested to me, before the colloquy between him and the Senator from Colorado, that we could not finish the bill tonight, and that the Senator from West Virginia had a substitute which would require 2 or 3 hours, and the Senator from West Virginia confirmed that, it occurred to me that we might as well recess, and I so stated. I still am of that

opinion, and regardless of what the Senate wishes to do about it, I feel impelled to make a motion that the Senate now recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to debate the motion. I want to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has any business been transacted since the last call?

Mr. STEWART. If there has not been any business transacted I should like to know what one would call it.

Mr. BARKLEY. There has been a good deal of talk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has been transacted. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate take a recess until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and called the name of Mr. AIKEN, who voted in the affirmative.

Mr. STEWART. What became of my suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. MAYBANK. A call for the yeas and nays is business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STEWART. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to know what constitutes business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To argue that out might take a good deal of time. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded calling the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr.

THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 17, as follows:

#### YEAS—45

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Murdock
Austin	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Brooks	Kilgore	Revercomb
Burch	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Tobey
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Eastland	McFarland	Wagner
Ferguson	McMahon	Walsh
Gurney	Magnuson	Wheeler
Hart	Millikin	White
Hawkes	Mitchell	Wiley
Hayden	Moore	Wilson

#### NAYS—17

Ball	Maybank	Saltonstall
Byrd	Morse	Smith
Fulbright	O'Mahoney	Stanfill
Green	Pepper	Stewart
Johnston, S. C.	Reed	Tydings
Knowland	Russell	

#### NOT VOTING—34

Andrews	Cordon	Murray
Bailey	Downey	Myers
Bankhead	Ellender	Robertson
Bilbo	George	Taylor
Brewster	Gerry	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gossett	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Guffey	Vandenberg
Butler	Hatch	Wherry
Capehart	Huffman	Willis
Capper	Lucas	Young
Carville	McKellar	
Chavez	Mead	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 5, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Robert L. Allworth, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia. (Mr. Allworth is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 6, 1946.)

John White Stuart, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia. (Mr. Stuart is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 6, 1946.)

William Holroyd McGinnis, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia. (Mr. McGinnis is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 12, 1945.)

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### POSTMASTERS

###### ARKANSAS

Allie Marie Lanier, Joiner, Ark., in place of H. B. Carlock, resigned.

Otho Norris, Poughkeepsie, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

###### CALIFORNIA

Ella M. Cain, Bridgeport, Calif., in place of D. A. Vogt, resigned.

###### COLORADO

Earl A. Riggs, Gilcrest, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

###### FLORIDA

Glenn J. Liles, Bonita Springs, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margaret E. Livingston, Holt, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

## GEORGIA

Clarence E. Hope, Homer, Ga., in place of G. J. Hope, retired.

## LOUISIANA

Verlie Bollinger, Alco, La., in place of W. Z. Lewis, resigned.

## MICHIGAN

Chauncey E. Brown, Eben Junction, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Georgia Hinkle, Montgomery, Mich., in place of E. E. Derr, resigned.

Emery Massie, Quinnesec, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Frank A. Smith, Jacksonville, N. C., in place of R. C. Warlick, deceased.

Hazel P. Strickland, Stedman, N. C., in place of N. C. Strickland, retired.

## OHIO

Alta G. Chambers, Kimbolton, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James W. King, Martinsville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

## OREGON

Madge L. Herron, Shevlin, Oreg., in place of L. M. Gumbert, resigned.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Florence E. Chamberlin, Hallstead, Pa., in place of L. M. Tierney, deceased.

Daniel S. Graeff, Hershey, Pa., in place of T. H. Black. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nelle I. York, Mount Braddock, Pa., in place of O. C. York, deceased.

Grant W. McElhatten, Oil City, Pa., in place of J. F. Hahn, removed.

Martin E. Byers, Saagerstown, Pa., in place of E. B. Luce, resigned.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Wilbur E. Williams, Wagener, S. C., in place of W. E. Williams, term expired.

## TENNESSEE

James E. Meador, Dixon Springs, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gilmer S. Brimm, Riddleton, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

## WISCONSIN

Oscar W. Lindall, Cushing, Wis., in place of C. J. Askov, retired.

Edna Aschinger, Tigerton, Wis., in place of A. B. Roemer, transferred.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

## IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

## To Quartermaster Corps

Lt. Col. Edward Harris Barr, with rank from August 4, 1944.

Maj. Raymond Miller Barton, with rank from June 12, 1942.

Maj. Robert Albert Howard, Jr., with rank from June 9, 1945.

Capt. Thad Adolphus Broom, with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. Roland Arthur Elliott, Jr., with rank from June 13, 1943.

First Lt. James Terry Craig, with rank from June 14, 1941.

## To Finance Department

Lt. Col. John Raikes Vance, with rank from December 11, 1942.

## To Corps of Engineers

First Lt. Michael Frank Allotta, with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Oscar Marion Brumfiel, with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Walter Fritz, with rank from May 29, 1945.

First Lt. LeMoyné Francis Michels, with rank from June 11, 1944.

Second Lt. Carroll Hamilton Wood, with rank from December 1, 1944.

## To Ordnance Department

Maj. Holger Nelson Toftoy, with rank from June 12, 1943.

First Lt. Charles Thomas Claggett, with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. James Paul Hamill, with rank from October 5, 1945.

First Lt. Roger Stevens Neumeister, with rank from June 11, 1944.

## To Chemical Warfare Service

First Lt. Harold Harley Haaland, with rank from October 5, 1945.

## To Cavalry

Second Lt. Milton Henry DeVault, with rank from June 5, 1945.

## To Field Artillery

Second Lt. John Tyler Elliott, with rank from June 6, 1944.

Second Lt. Robin Schofield Kendall, with rank from June 6, 1944.

## To Infantry

First Lt. Carlyle Philip Woelfer, with rank from October 5, 1945.

Second Lt. William Benjamin Tuttle, Jr., with rank from June 6, 1944.

## To Air Corps

First Lt. William Noel Snouffer, with rank from June 12, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Robert Boyd Williams and other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States which were received by the Senate and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs on Monday, June 3, 1946, and which appear in full in the Senate Proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert Boyd Williams on page 6145 and ending with the name of Elliott Powell Rigby on page 6153.

## IN THE NAVY

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

## To be ensigns

William P. Ferguson  
William L. Landreth  
Charles F. Weiss

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

William J. Bush  
James H. Elsom

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign

Thomas C. Cain, Jr. John W. Hirst  
William C. Croft Frank H. McDonald  
Joseph A. Fernald

## POSTMASTERS

## COLORADO

Gladys Robinson, Fort Garland.

## ILLINOIS

Robert J. Beck, Cornell.

## IOWA

Florence H. Whittenburg, Dickens.  
Cyrus C. Peterson, Randall.

## KENTUCKY

Edna P. Leger, Baxter.  
John S. Mahan, Princeton.

## MAINE

Nelida Arsenault, Mexico.

## MICHIGAN

Mildred E. Bobb, Genesee.  
Marion W. Carter, Glennie.  
Verner M. Godell, Watton.

## MISSISSIPPI

Beulah M. Weilenman, Stoneville.

## MONTANA

Henry J. Latsch, Fort Harrison.

## NEW JERSEY

George B. Seals, Whitehouse.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Gladys V. Bachmeier, Selfridge.

## OHIO

E. Alice Rushton, Kingsville.

## WASHINGTON

Lola C. Fisher, Richmond Beach.  
John W. Weaver, Rochester.  
Arloene Marchant, Seaview.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 4 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

## POSTMASTER

Harvey D. Kemper to be postmaster at Caledonia, in the State of Wisconsin.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Redeemer, do Thou guide and direct us even when we choose to walk alone. Lonely souls are comforted that Thy love springs from Thy compassion rather than from our merits. Behold, O God, the things that matter for our beloved country—sacrifice, unselfishness, and genuine patriotism. With this vision before us, crown us with a might transcending weakness, with a hope that reaches far beyond pain and sorrow, and with a determination that waits for the unveiling of all misunderstandings. Be Thou the power within ourselves, that we may contribute to the abiding realities of a great Nation. Keep us free, dear Lord, and teach us that the best we can do for Thee is to live uprightly and do justly, fearless in the defense of that which is right and in condemnation of the wrong. In the name of the great Teacher we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 208. An act for the relief of the Marion Contracting Co.;

H. R. 216. An act for the relief of John Seferian and Laura Seferian;

H. R. 238. An act for the relief of Henrietta Silk;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Douglas Charles McRae, a minor;

H. R. 845. An act for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes;

H. R. 1037. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida;

H. R. 1072. An act for the relief of Henry R. Butler;

H. R. 1229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary M. Wolf;

H. R. 1238. An act for the relief of Father Peter B. Duffee;